

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_121979
Title of the Manuscript:	The top 100 most cited articles on composite resin in dentistry: A bibliometric analysis
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> 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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Bibliometric analysis is a method used to measure and analyze scientific output through statistical data, such as the number of publications, citations, and other related metrics. However, there are certain disadvantages to this method:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Superficial analysis: Bibliometric analysis focuses on quantitative data (e.g., the number of citations) without considering the quality or the actual impact of the content of the works. 2. Bias and misconceptions: The analysis can be influenced by biases, such as the emphasis on specific fields or regions due to language, geographic distribution, or popular scientific journals. 3. Overlooking the complexity of scientific progress: Scientific progress is often multidimensional, and bibliometric analysis cannot fully capture the contributions from collaborations, interdisciplinary work, or creativity in research methods. 4. Unreliable data: The data used for bibliometric analyses can be incomplete or inaccurate, affecting the results. 5. Discouragement of groundbreaking research: Because bibliometric analysis often emphasizes measurable citations, it may discourage researchers from pursuing new and unestablished areas that may not immediately gain high visibility or citations. 	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>YES</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>YES</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>YES</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript is well-written, and the effort and hard work of the authors are commendable. However, I do not consider this manuscript to be valuable due to the reasons I explained earlier.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>YES</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>YES</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

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:	Aristidis Galiatsatos
Department, University & Country	University of West Attica, Greece