

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_126126
Title of the Manuscript:	A Comparative Evaluation of Shear Bond Strength of a Self-Adhering Flowable Composite and a Bulk-Fill flowable Composite to Pulp capping materials including NEO MTA PLUS, Dycal, Biodentine and MTA: In Vitro study
Type of the 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

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.	I think its important especially in selecting the most appropriate type according to particular clinical situation. Put in mind the aesthetic and the correct use of flowable composite resin material. PLEASE SEE MANUSCRIPT	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I suggest this tittle and you are free to fix it or not(Investigation the shear bond strength of a self-adhering flowable composite and a bulk-fill flowable composite to different pulp capping materials: an in vitro study.	
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.	I suggest to add more informative details in the section of material and method.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Need some additions I denote them in the file	
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.	The manuscript need some corrections and in order to become the manuscript more accurate I request from the author(s) to explain them and add according to the notes.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, the references are sufficient.	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	I prefer that the author(s) should correct the manuscript according to the comments of reviewers .	

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:	Shurooq Falih Altaie
Department, University & Country	Middle Technical University, Iraq