

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>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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 manuscript and study by authors is praiseworthy, although all the pictures on materials and methods are suggested to be presented (regarding the groups-12,3 & EMIC® DL 500 Universal Assay Machine. Also suggested to kindly incorporate the recent studies in the present context. Limitations also are to be mentioned.	
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 is suggested to kindly incorporate the recent studies in the present context. Limitations also are to be mentioned. Published studies do suggest other methods to increase surface area of bonding surface which are superior to sandblasting procedure.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	Recent studies did attempt to assess the shear bond strength in this regard. It is suggested to Kindly include the following recent references:- 1. Miller M, Mon HH, Xu X, Chapple A, Dupree P, Ballard RW, Armbruster P. Shear bond strength of adhesive precoated brackets: A comparative in vitro study. Int Orthod. 2023 Jun;21(2):100752. doi: 10.1016/j.ortho.2023.100752. Epub 2023 Apr 14. PMID: 37062199.	

Review Form 3

	2. Golshah A, Bagheri N, Moslem Imani M, Safari-Faramani R. Effects of different types of laser etching versus phosphoric acid etching on shear bond strength of metal brackets to human enamel: A systematic review and meta-analysis of in vitro studies. Int Orthod. 2020 Dec;18(4):673-683. doi: 10.1016/j.ortho.2020.10.001. Epub 2020 Nov 2. PMID: 33144060.	
<u>Minor REVISION</u> comments	yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	nil	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sumit Munjal
Department, University & Country	India