

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_128062
Title of the Manuscript:	Hydroxyherderite as a novel filler for a dental adhesive
Type of the Article	Original Research 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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The topic of the manuscript is interesting and relevant to the journals readership. The authors presented a novel beryllium based filler (hydroxylherderite) and evaluated its effects on the adhesive properties. Lack of other reports in the scientific literature about incorporation of hydroxylherderite in dental materials speaks to the novelty and importance of this manuscript.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is suitable.	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive. Consider adding in the Aims section which properties of the resulting material were evaluated (...degree of conversion, microhardness, mineral deposition and cytotoxicity).	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically correct. The scientific problem and aims of the study are well defined. The methodology used in this study is well described in details. Based on the employed methodology the obtained results are valid and well interpreted.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient and recent. 30% of listed references are published within the last 10 years.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English style is good and suitable for publication.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>overall the manuscript is very well written and suitable for publication, minimal corrections are suggested</p> <p>Consider adding hypothesis statement at the end of the Introduction section.</p> <p>Please rephrase the first sentence in the Discussion section.</p>	

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:	Milan Miljkovic
Department, University & Country	University of Nis, Serbia