

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_81015
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of Light-Curing Techniques on Dental Resins - A Cross-Sectional Study
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.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	<p>I found the Introduction very simple and does not captivate the reader for the study. It describes DRC in a very simple way and does not draw the reader's attention for the importance of the study. Only one article that is less than 5 years old is presented. Authors should re-write the Introduction, presenting more recent researches on the theme and explaining why this subject is important.</p> <p>A null hypothesis must be added to the introduction section.</p> <p>How did the authors calculate the sample size? Did they use power analysis? For each mechanical experiment n must be given in detailed way.</p> <p>Many parts of the material method section are not very clear and should be rewritten in detail.</p> <p>Authors should describe how the material was handled, in which proportion and for how long before inserting it into the moulds. Even if the manufacturer's recommendation was followed for these procedures, authors should describe them.</p> <p>The material used in the study, the contents, batch numbers of the material, light curing devices, manufacturers must be specified.</p> <p>Is there any heat conductor used between thermocouple and the material? If not this situation should be reconsidered. Also, the authors used metal mould that is heat conductive. This must be reconsidered when using thermocouples for assessing heat generation.</p> <p>There is no comment on light intensity in the results and discussion section</p> <p>Overall, the methodology is very simple. Authors did not present any innovation in the study and several studies have already been performed regarding this subject.</p> <p>The authors stated that 'DRC sorption and solubility characteristics (Table 2) revealed a statistically negligible difference between the two samples (p=0.001)' but p=0.001 shows a statistically significant difference. Also, in discussion section those differences must be discussed.</p>	All the necessary corrections were done as indicated
Minor REVISION comments	however there are some grammar mistakes	Grammatical mistakes are rectified
Optional/General 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	