

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>
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.	The manuscript may have a good impact for further research, but it is not quite impressive and helpful for further research to be done following this manuscript results. It is more as only an analysis to present the current situation of composite resin research in dentistry. However, the way of this manuscript presentation is good but need some amendment at result and discussion part to be more precise and more impactful outcome for this paper.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Maybe a more scientific title would be good.	
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.	Acceptable. Suggest including the review aim and clearer explanation on the methodology.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Should add conclusion section at the end of the manuscript.	
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.	Should the author have explained more on the methodology of extracting the journal as the flowchart is not that clear. However, the result presentation is good but need to only include result that are more impactful or important to present. The discussion is good only to make it shorter also to a more important discussion to be written.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes. Acceptable.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes. Acceptable with the need of minor revision on the language.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Please refer to the comment in the manuscript too.	

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:	Nusima Mohamed
Department, University & Country	Universiti Sains Islam Malaysia, Malaysia