

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_126866
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARISON OF SHEAR STRENGTH AFTER BONDING OF ORTHODONTIC BRACKETS WITH IMMEDIATE AND LATE LIGHT CURING
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the 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

<u>Compulsory</u> 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>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The article discusses a matter that encounters every Orthodontist in his/her daily practice. The article breaks it down for the practitioner regarding the upsides of the Bonding Types & Times. The article sheds the light on a bewildering matter for Orthodontists. It sends a sort of "emergency signals" to practitioners pertinent to the importance of the "Composite Exposure Time" and its relevance to failure possibility.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	It needs slight corrections: E.G. "Andeach" written within abstract "Fourth Line". Lingual Erratum! In Statistical Analysis: "ANOVA test was used with a selection criterion and the Tukey test when necessary"! Not Clarified, and it looks like a sort of potential downside! . . .	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	I think so.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	It's fair!!	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Mhd Azhar Kharsa
Department, University & Country	UK