

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	

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 article deals with a problem that still occurs during endodontic treatment. The materials have changed significantly during the last decade, so studying the properties of those new materials by independent research teams is necessary. There are many studies on these materials. Quite a significant part of them are on microleakage.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is too long. Maybe it will sound better 'Comparison of the sealing ability of a glass ionomer cement and different bioceramic materials'	
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.	It is comprehensive.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	There are several things that should be changed. The introduction is mainly narrative. There is no reasoning why the authors chose to study these materials, what are their benefits and advantages. The methodology is not complete – what was the size of the burs for the access cavity preparation, the technique for the placement of the studied materials should be explained in detail. Why was the microleakage studied from inside the cavity? Usually, the humidity and bacteria come from outside (periodontal tissue, oral fluids) not from the inner side of the cavity, that is covered and sealed with a restoration. Table one is not necessary. The results should be explained in more details, not only presented on tables. Paragraph 5 is more likely to be in materials and methods. The chosen size of the perforation to be prepared is not reasoned well. The sentence 'In this investigation, we employed the dye penetration method, due to its convenience of use and difficulty compared to other methods' sounds strange. If MTA was found to discolor methylene blue dye and fuchsin did not, then why is used methylene blue? Isn't that a prerequisite for a possible misleading result? The following paragraphs describe the properties of the materials, without really trying to explain the achieved results. Maybe their place is more appropriate to be in the introduction. The discussion should be corrected.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are recent.	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language should be checked.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Mirela Marinova Takorova
Department, University & Country	Medical University of Sofia, Bulgaria