

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_113830
Title of the Manuscript:	Shear Bond Strength of Self-Adhesive Versus Conventional Low-Viscosity Composite Resins. In Vitro Study
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>Dear respected authors; several areas in this paper need significant improvement before a final decision and consideration for publication, as follow:</p> <p>1.The method used is not new, and deficiencies exist in :</p> <p>a) criteria for specimen selection, b) method of evaluation C) Protocol used for evaluation.</p> <p>2.Materials and Methods Ethics Approval: Is there any formal reference for approval of the ethics Methodology?</p> <p>3. In systematic review research question is important. In this paper research question is not designed based on a universal set of criteria. In the abstract and introduction sections; no solid study background and study questions.</p> <p>4. The big problem (limitations) is the applied method for evaluation and confirmation of the results by adequate intra and /Or inter-examiner calibrations. . The evaluations were not repeated (No proper inter or intra-examiner evaluation).</p> <p>5.Problems (weak points) exist regarding the applied methodology specific to standardizations:</p> <p>a. Procedure of cleaning the specimens. b. exclusion of the role of mechanical cleaning. So technically is not accurate. . No adequate justification in the discussion section. c. Reviewed reported sample size and power calculations are also missed.</p> <p>d.The description of the methods used is not clear and not adequate:</p> <p>6.Documented high-quality photographs are mandatory.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>acceptable</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Bestoon Mohammed Faraj
Department, University & Country	University of Sulaimani, College of Dentistry, Iraq