

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Dental Sciences |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJDS_128737 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | COMPARATIVE EVALUATION OF SEALING ABILITY OF RESIN MODIFIED GLASS IONOMER CEMENT, ProRoot MTA, BIODENTINE AND BIO-C REPAIR IN FURCATION PERFORATION BY USING DYE PENETRATION TEST: AN IN VITRO STUDY |
| Type of the Article | Experimental paper |

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 authors have used a dye penetration technique to determine who various candidate materials for endodontic sealing protect against leakage. A range of contemporary materials have been studied. All materials gave less leakage than the unsealed control. However, their performance varies, from resin-modified glass-ionomer (least effective sealer) to Bio C Repair (most effective). These findings are of potential clinical importance. | |
| 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. | The Abstract is fine as composed. | |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | No. Here are changes needed: (i) Delete Figure 11. There is no justification for the order in which the results are presented for the materials. A straight-line graph should only be used where there is a continuous variation in the parameters of the x axis. In the case of specific individual materials, this is not the case. Plus, all the relevant data appear in Table 2, so the attempted graph merely repeats everything. (ii) Never, ever use the phrase "within the limitations of the study". It is always unnecessary and is scientifically unsound. Delete it from the Conclusion and the sentence will make more sense. | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | No. (i) References are not all formatted the same. Correct this. They should all be in the same style, e.g. in terms of capital letters and journal abbreviations. Check what the style is for this particular journal, and put every reference into this style. (ii) Either cite references by number, listing them at the end in the order used, or cite them in the form Hassan et al, in which case list them in alphabetical order at the end. (iii) Never use given names and/or initials of authors in the text. Authors should be referred to as Hassan et al only. (iv) There are several studies mentioned in the text, e.g. Hassan et al, Vanishree et al, Torabinejad et al, that do not appear in the reference list. This must be corrected. | |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Yes | |
| Optional/General comments | The name Septodont appears in the Discussion without a capital letter. This should be corrected. This paper must undergo major revision before it can be considered for publication. | |

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: | John Nicholson |
| Department, University & Country | Queen Mary University of London, United Kingdom |