

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</a>
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	Original research papers

### 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.journaljamr.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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Check English</b>  <b>The abstract is not acceptable</b>  <b>Objectives 1 and objective 2 are not very clear, too similar</b>  <b>Please detail more material and methods, change the way are presented. Now are mixed too much Where is used Bio-art and how?</b>  <b>At results and discussions, you repeat from material and methods, please rewrite this part.</b>  <b>You have results and results and discussions, choose just one style</b>  <b>Results and statistics are not very clear, tables and graphs are repeating the same values, and the meaning of the comparison is not very clear.</b>  <b>Eccentric contacts are determined on the working or non-working part? On the FGP or VA crown? These are 4 different types of data</b>  <b>Why do you make 2 -4 occlusal adjustments? I understand that adjustments are done until the patient is comfortable, I cite your paper "The necessary adjustments were done till there were uniform and no premature contacts."</b>  <b>Even for Wilcoxon N=3 is a bit small</b>  <b>Conclusions are unclear and not directly related to the title.</b></p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### PART 2:

	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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Mona Ionas</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University Lucian Blaga of Sibiu, Romania</b>