

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_79095
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of mouthwashes and brushing simulation on the surface roughness of a bulk filled composite resin - An invitro 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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>ABSTRACT</p> <p>Abstract lacks important information such as marked in the comments in the text:</p> <p>1) Please indicate which composite from Ivoclar was tested? Also, how many samples were tested and what was the groups (mouthwashes) tested?</p> <p>2) Please indicate the roughness parameter used</p> <p>3) What was the statistical tested applied?</p> <p>4) The conclusion indicates that the mouthrinse itself does not cause alterations at surface roughness. But it is not clear in the method section that there were groups with and without brushing. Abstract needs several revisions</p> <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>Check the comments indicate in the text regarding information that need further clarification</p> <p>5) The information: "Prevention starts right at home with brushing, flossing and the use of mouthrinses (1)" is too simplistic. The diet control is also relevant for caries.</p> <p>6) Introduction needs to contain information that shows the relevance of the study and how the aim is important to be checked. For instance, where are the evidence that toothbrushing changes the physical properties of the composites? What physical properties can be changed by brushing? How brushing induce such damage? It is the toothbrush the responsible for them or the dentifrice used? These information are important in the introduction.</p> <p>7) Then the authors should indicate why the use of mouthwash can induce damage to dent materials. Their composition might induce chemical or physical degradation? Also, povidine in a mouthwash indicate for constant use?? A singular use of mouthwash can induce sufficient damage? The authors should indicate the relevance of studying this to justify the study and make it attractive to the reader.</p> <p>METHODS</p> <p>8) The sample size results from pilot investigation or sample size calculation? Four specimens per group seems too few.</p> <p>9) Indicated which bulk fill composite was tested, and would be interesting to include its composition. Still, why only a bulk fill composite was tested? There are several commercial products available in the market. How testing only one can make the results presented relevant?</p> <p>10) What was the sample dimensions?</p> <p>11) What light cure unit was used?</p> <p>12) The brushing was made at the top (site which the light was applied) or the bottom of the specimen? Also, this shall be discussed.</p> <p>13) Why toothbrushing was not performed concomitant to the immersion in the mouthwash?</p> <p>14) Between immersions samples were kept moist? In water? Saliva?</p> <p>15) What was the velocity of the brushing machine? And the stylus profilometer was used to measure the roughness, right? What parameters were measured? How many measurements were made per specimen?</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:</p> <p>16) I am founding very confusing to determine how many samples per groups were tested. was four (table 1) or 8 (table 2)??? What was the mean values and standard deviation of the groups? What statistical tests were performed?</p> <p>17) What is the relevance of this sentence to justify the results: “Our team has extensive knowledge and research experience that has translated into high quality publications.(8–20),(21–25) (26) (27)” ? Most of this references its not from dental materials or the methods used in this study.</p> <p>18) The discussion does not explain the results found.</p> <p>19) The conclusion is not supported by the results. The use of mouthwash alone does not seem to be tested.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	The text needs to be speeled checked by an English native speaker.	
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:	Rayssa Ferreira Zanatta
Department, University & Country	University Of Brasilia, Brazil