

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_86857
Title of the Manuscript:	A STUDY TO COMPARE AND ADJUST THE NUMBER OF OCCLUSAL CONTACTS IN A PROVISIONAL RESTORATION IN CENTRIC OCCLUSION USING A VIRTUAL ARTICULATOR AND FUNCTIONALLY GENERATED PATH TECHNIQUE.
Type of the Article	

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The writing of the text needs to be improved, as well as its objectives are not clear at all, there are no hypotheses of the study that are fundamental to answer the question of the work.</p> <p>The inclusion and exclusion criteria are very embracing, it was not considered whether the patient had temporomandibular dysfunction or some parafunctional habit.</p> <p>The manufacturing technique of the provisional crowns was obtained in different ways and materials, which can become a bias in the study.</p> <p>For the virtual articulator, the intercondylar distance was not considered. How can it be extrapolated to patients with different measurements?</p> <p>There was a sample calculation for the study? There is no topic explaining the statistical analysis made.</p> <p>The tables, graphics, and results are presented before the heading "Results" in the text.</p> <p>It was a randomized clinical trial? It is important to randomize the patients' sample for more confiability of the results.</p> <p>The images are poor quality.</p> <p>It's important to give the clinical relevance of the study, especially in a clinical trial.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>English needs to be reviewed by a proficiency corrector.</p> <p>Lack of literature evidence about the theme, and too old references included in the study, they need to be updated by the last 5 years.</p>	
Optional/General comments	Improve text writing in a more didactic way	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	Laís Carolina Landim Gomes
Department, University & Country	São Paulo State University – UNESP, Brazil