

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>Compulsory 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>1. Yes, this manuscript is important for the scientific community, as long-term clinical follow-ups after treatment provide valuable insights into the effectiveness and durability of the therapeutic approach. Such studies contribute to evidence-based practice and can inform future treatment guidelines.</p> <p>2. This title is already quite descriptive and conveys the study's focus on using Bulk Fill composite resin for ... If you'd like to make it more concise, you could consider the following revised title: "Bulk Fill Composite Resin for Non-carious Cervical Lesions: A 24-Month Randomized Clinical Study" The term "double blind" may not be as crucial for a clinical study on dental restorative materials.</p> <p>3. Yes, this abstract offers a detailed summary of the study's purpose, methodology, results and conclusions, making it more comprehensive and informative for readers.</p> <p>4. Yes, The organization of the manuscript into distinct subsections and its overall structure are suitable, allowing for easy comprehension of the research findings and their implications.</p> <p>5. To enhance the scientific rigor of the manuscript, a more thorough examination of table 4 to 9, is recommended. Specifically, providing a detailed explanation of rows 2 and 3 for the Z350 control group in each table would give readers valuable context for interpreting the data. Additionally, a comprehensive comparison between the Z350 and Bulk Fill groups, focusing not only on statistical significance but also on the underlying reasons for the observed outcomes after 720 days, would strengthen the overall analysis. By incorporating these suggestions, the manuscript will offer a more robust understanding of research findings and their implications.</p> <p>6. The provided references are indeed relevant and fairly recent. However, I believe the manuscript's discussion part could benefit from incorporating additional resources that delve deeper into specific aspects of the research topic. In this regard, I recommend considering the review available at https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32785019/. Such this resources provide valuable insights that could be help enrich the analysis and interpretation of the findings ultimately strengthening the overall quality of the manuscript.</p> <p>* In the Materials and Methods section, a reference should be added to support the statement 'The number of restorations was based on a previous study'.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>To maintain clarity and consistency, I recommend using "bulk-fill" or "bulk fill" uniformly throughout the manuscript.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Nilofar Bahramian
Department, University & Country	Iran