

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_119714
Title of the Manuscript:	Restoration of Caries-Free Cervical Lesions with Bulk Fill Composite Resin – A 24-Month Randomized, Double-Blind Clinical Study
Type of the Article	Original Research 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 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Clinical studies are very important for the literature.</p> <p>In the title and abstract, the term "Caries-Free Cervical Lesions" is used, whereas in the subsequent sections of the manuscript, the abbreviation "NCCL" is employed. In the literature, the term "Non-Carious Cervical Lesions" is more commonly used. Therefore, it is recommended to consistently use "Non-Carious Cervical Lesions" throughout the manuscript.</p> <p>In the USPHS criteria, the name of the criterion should be used exactly as defined. The abstract contains different criterion descriptions. It would be more appropriate if these are revised to match the exact definitions.</p> <p>It is recommended to include batch numbers for all materials listed in Table 3. Providing this information enhances the reproducibility and transparency of the study, allowing other researchers to accurately replicate the experiment or compare the results with other studies using the same materials.</p> <p>In the material methods section "Immediate finishing involved removing excess composite resin with a high-speed diamond bur under adequate cooling, and polishing the restorations was performed 30 days after the restorative treatment." Why was polishing performed 30 days after the restorative treatment? This seems to be a long period. Please provide a reference for this practice. And author say "Restorations were clinically evaluated according to the United States Public Health Services (USPHS) criteria described by Cvar and Ryge in 1971 (Table 3) at initial, 7, 30, 180, and 720 days." Checking restorations before polishing at 30 days is unusual and seems erroneous.</p> <p>Flow chart should be added</p> <p>Detailed Explanation of Calibration for Operators and Evaluators</p> <p>The manuscript should provide a thorough explanation of how the operators and evaluators were calibrated. Calibration is essential to ensure consistency and reliability in the application of the adhesives and the evaluation of the restorations. This process typically involves:</p> <p>Training Sessions: Conducting initial training sessions where operators and evaluators are instructed on standardized procedures and criteria for restoration placement and assessment. Mock Trials: Performing mock trials or practice restorations and evaluations to ensure all personnel achieve a consistent level of performance and understanding. Intra- and Inter-Examiner Reliability: Assessing intra- and inter-examiner reliability through statistical measures (e.g., kappa statistics) to confirm that the evaluators produce consistent results both within their own assessments and compared to their peers. Continuous Monitoring: Implementing periodic re-calibration sessions throughout the study to</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	address any drift in techniques or evaluation criteria, ensuring that high standards are maintained throughout the 36-month period. Providing detailed information on these calibration procedures will enhance the credibility of the study by demonstrating rigorous methodological standards.	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language of the manuscript should be reviewed.	
Optional/General comments	<p>“In this study, the most frequent gender was male, representing 55.5% of the cases. Conversely, an observational study by Pontes et al. (2021) showed a higher frequency of NCCLs in females (51.4%). It is noted that gender is not directly related to the appearance of these lesions, but rather the age group of affected individuals. This is related to a longer exposure time to etiological factors associated with NCCLs” Additional sources can also be referenced, such as the study by Tepe and Irmak (2023), which discusses the clinical performance of non-carious cervical lesions. “TEPE, HATICE; IRMAK, Ö. Clinical performance of non-carious cervical lesions restored with using self-etch mode of adhesives according to the FDI criteria. Australian Dental Journal, 2023, 68.4: 255-264.”</p> <p>Overall, the references provided in the manuscript are insufficient. There are more recent references available on this topic. This limitation should be addressed. Additionally, the language of the manuscript should be edited, with careful attention paid to the use of terms. The manuscript may be acceptable after revision. However, the rationale for performing polishing on the 30th day remains questionable for me.</p>	

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:	Hatice Tepe
Department, University & Country	Eskisehir Osmangazi University, Turkey