

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_126065
Title of the Manuscript:	"A Comparative Study on Dentinal Tubule Penetration of Endodontic Irrigants: Confocal Laser Microscopy Insights"
Type of the Article	Original article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	This is an interesting study and I think that the data are informative, concise, Sufficient information about the previous study findings is presented for readers to follow the present study rationale and procedures. Highly clinically relevant information included.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	yes	
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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The abstract is well-written however, it needs to be structured with subheadings. 2. The lack of study design. 3. A simple and concise conclusion should be added. 	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	It is scientifically correct; however, it needs to increase the standardization values for sample selection in precise age range, root length after sectioning the crown, the initial file size, the exclusion criteria like (not previously endo-treated, no visible root cracks) and the points selected for the transverse sectioning should be standardized.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Yes	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	<p>This article is a really interesting topic and needs minor organization.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. P.1 Keywords: capitalize c in confocal laser microscope 2. P.2 Materials and method: line 7 round-shape root canal is better corrected as oval-shape root canal as it is rarely to found a round shape canal only 1-2 mm from apical foramen. 3. P.4 Statistics: table no2 better to be in single page. 4. P.6 Discussion: line 10 (reported tha) correct to (reported that). 5. P.7 Discussion: line 2 mention the abbreviation CTAB as full name before. 6. P.13 References: the font in references no. 72,77.78 and 79 should be the same as the rest references. 	

Review Form 3

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:	Huda Sameer Albaker
Department, University & Country	University of Baghdad, Iraq