

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_79239
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARISON OF SURFACE ROUGHNESS OF TWO COMMERCIALY AVAILABLE GLASS IONOMER CEMENTS AFTER BRUSHING SIMULATION WITH HERBAL AND FLUORIDATED TOOTHPASTE - AN IN VITRO STUDY
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>

Review Form 1.6

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the methodology part, I recommend adding some information to facilitate the interpretation of the results: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mention the types of glass ionomer cement used as to their composition of the two commercial brands. (conventional, reinforced or resinous). 2. Specify the composition and <u>abrasiveness</u> of the two brands of toothpaste used. 3. Specify the type of bristles or trademark of brushes used in the brushing cycle <p>Furthermore, I believe that these factors also contribute to the research results that can be explored in the discussion.</p> • In the results and discussion part, I recommend emphasizing that the results obtained in vitro do not fully reflect what happens with the restorative glass ionomer cement in the oral cavity. In addition to brushing cycles, several factors can interfere with the roughness and longevity of a dental material in the oral environment: oral microbiota, quality of salivary flow, salivary composition, type of diet, presence of parafunctional habits, patient age, occlusion, location of the restoration (cervical region, anterior or posterior region), risk of caries, duration, intensity and frequency of brushing, patient's compositional state (calm vs. anxious) Furthermore, the force that is applied during brushing may vary. These are variables that also need to be considered in the discussion of the article. • In the Conclusion you can also mention that the results in the oral cavity may or are different from those found in vitro. The mechanical properties of a restorative material, as well as its longevity, susceptibility to fracture and appearance of roughness, may be associated with a series of factors inherent to the product and to the patient. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the discussion it can be explored which roughness values on the surfaces of the materials used can interfere with the properties of the glass ionomer cement. • Recommend using the term dental biofilm in place of dental plaque. 	
Optional/General comments	-----	

Review Form 1.6

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Marcelo Gadelha Vasconcelos
Department, University & Country	State University of Paraíba, Brazil