

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

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>
<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>The scientific community is impacted by the manuscript. A bibliographic analysis of composite resin in dentistry is covered in the manuscript, and this is very important information for academics working in this field. The manuscript also includes a comprehensive assessment of the literature on numerous studies conducted on composite resin, which might be a fantastic resource for independently identifying a particular paper. Numerous selection filters, including those based on country, author-coauthor correlation, citation number, and others, can also be utilized. These filters can be quite helpful for the research community working on this subject.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes, the title is suitable.</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, the manuscript's abstract is thorough. For researchers, tightening the abstract can save more time.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</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>Due to the strikingly rigorous manner of engaging with the given research topic, the book gives an impression of a technically sound, scientifically sound work. For obtaining and developing the information the manuscript employs not only complex analysis tools, the results of which were not previously observed in the literature, but it also employs the standard methodological techniques. The paper also shows proficiency within the subject matter as is evident from a comprehensive literature review done within the paper. The proper set-up of study and statistical and computational procedures effectively secures the validity and accuracy of the outcomes demonstrated.</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, the references are sufficient and recent.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language in the article appears to be generally clear and suitable for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Use same type of intext citation. You used this "[]" instead of "[]".</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:	Durjoy Datta Mazumder
Department, University & Country	Rajshahi University of Engineering & Technology, Bangladesh