

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JPRI_118991</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Influence of aging on the microleakage in Class-V composite restorations: an in-vitro study</b>
Type of the 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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. Yes, it was very insightful and helps understand how to approach class V restorations in different age groups. Intersting study.</p> <p>2. Yes but would also include that the study is on etching technique as well, therefore alternate heading can be "Influence of age and etching technique on microleakage of class V composite restorations:an in-vitro study"</p> <p>3. Yes, well written</p> <p>4. Yes, well written</p> <p>5. Yes, the explanations are well written</p> <p>6. References are sufficient</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Yes but has a few spelling mistakes	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Very interesting read and research topic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Though some areas were repetitive, the last 2 paragraphs in introduction are repetitive</li> <li>- The sentence in 2.2 restorative procedure "Subsequently, the longitudinal section of specimens were done in a buccolingual direction under constant water to remove any debris created by the cutting of specimens using a low-speed diamond blade" does not make sense, what was done should be stated clearly.</li> <li>- The last paragraph in results was very confusing, please word it to simplify the results. The stastistical differences were not observed but then were observed? I did not understand it.</li> </ul>	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Priya Jitendra Mistry</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Nairobi, Kenya</b>