SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JPRI_53721**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Cone-beam computed tomography guidance in functional endoscopic sinus surgery: a retrospective cohort study**
Type of the Article	**Original Article**

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty'**, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.
To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's comment** *(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**1.What type of polyposis cases were included in the study? Was it extensive disease or minimal disease?** **2.Introduction- "This technique includes insertion of a slender endoscope and other tools through nostrils to widen sinus pathways by removing cartilages and small bones" – Sinus surgery will invariably include removal of bone and tissue, not cartilage.** **3.Is there mistake in inclusion and exclusion criteria?** **4."After obtaining CBCT images, patients with positive pathologic findings on CBCT underwent therapeutic sinus endoscopy under general anesthesia, and those without pathologic findings on CBCT underwent diagnostic sinus endoscopy"- Could you explain about diagnostic and therapeutic sinus endoscopy?** **5. Please explain more about the methodology of surgical procedure.**	The manuscript has been thoroughly modified
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's comment** *(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	