

Review Form 1.8

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_120034
Title of the Manuscript:	The 100 most cited articles on glass ionomer cement: a bibliometric analysis
Type of the 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:

(<https://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.8

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Is the manuscript important for scientific community? <i>(Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to justify your answer)</i>	The manuscript is very important because it demonstrates the significance of application GIC in dentistry over five decades	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the article's title makes sense. It is lucid, succinct, and accurately depicts the paper's content,	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	Yes, the article's abstract covers everything. The research topic, methods, findings, and study consequences are comprehensively outlined. Additionally, the abstract is well-written and simple to understand.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the manuscript's organization and subsections are appropriate. The material is easy to read and is clearly arranged. Subsections are informative and logical.	
Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? <i>(Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to justify your answer)</i>	Yes, the manuscript seems to be correct as a scientific point of view. The methodology is sound, the results are presented in a clear and concise manner with the help of table and graph. Clear and succinct conclusions are also provided.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	Some recent references of year 2022-2024 are needed.	
Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Except some grammatical mistakes overall the quality of article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments	The work is interesting, well-written and broad spectrum of scholars are likely to find it interesting.	

[Review Form 1.8](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Namita Bhardwaj
Department, University & Country	Dr. C.V Raman University, India