

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMMR_120787</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Ozonated water decreases in vitro contamination at dental implant interface in different connections</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

#### **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:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is very interesting due it suggest a novel way for implant abutment interface decontamination. Although the concept of minor contamination of conical interface is already proved, the manuscript point out the difference with external hex connection in a particular brand of implant and also described the efficiency of ozonized water in both situations. A nice discussion compares the results of this research with other ways of treatment	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title is appropriate	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Abstract is comprehensive and well written	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Sections are appropriate although I preferred separate Results and Discussion sections	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is correct due is well written, with appropriate references and discussion. The method is adequate and well design Number of samples is adequate Statistic is correct The conclusions show a novel approach for prevention and treatment of peri-implant diseases The overall of the research is very good	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	References are adequate and recent, enough quantity	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language is well utilized, for more precision a native translator could be consulted	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Excellent overall of the research	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Juan Carlos Ibanez
Department, University & Country	Catholic University of Cordoba, Argentine