Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JAMMR_75272**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Assessment the effect of acid and base cycling on mechanical properties of various esthetic restorative materials**
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:

(http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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	**Introduction** - the motivations for this study need to be made clearer. In particular, the connection between the pH cycling and the mechanical properties, thay could be clearer. - Acid and base cycling is the main focus in this study. It is recommended to state results of some previous studies related to pH cycling for any dental material - The aim of study is not clearly defined; it suggested to contains pH cycling –dental materials –mechanical properties **Methods and Materials** - Names of product should should only existed in this section (avoid in the Abstract). It should be written in brackets as (brand, manufacturer, city, state if any, country) - It is recommended to state the exact materials used, instead of stating "tooth-colored restorative material" - It would be much better to describe what are being analyzed besides mentioning the statistical tools **Results** The results are not clearly explained that may confuse the readers; there is no explanation for Table 3 and there is not enough explanation for Table 4. However, it is suggested to express essential data from Tables 3 and 4 that could easily be summarized in text. Please ensure that your intended meaning was maintained in this edit - "All mechanical properties of Tetric N Ceram bulk fill and RMGI reduced significantly than those stored in distilled water" - "all mechanical properties of TNB were more susceptible to pH cycling than conventional composites" **Discussion** The authors have tried to discuss the results in such a way. However, such lengthy discussions can be confusing because they are not well structured. It is strongly suggested be structured first in relation to Table 2. In this case, a more in-depth discussion is necessary to explain the effect of pH cycling on each respective	

	mechanical property, as pH cycling is the main focus of this study. Further, do the discussion based on each dental material.
	Finally, us the results of previous studies to clarify and support the results of this study.
	
	Limitations are discussed, however, there are some parts that need to be considered. The statement "separated acidic and alkaline mediums should have been used" is a bit confusing because the treatment for acid and base cycling in this study was separated acidic and alkaline cycling. In addition, it is recommended that the “future research” is structured in such a way that it is easy to understand.
	
	Conclusion:
	
	The conclusion are supported by appropriate evidence. However, it would be cleared to in detail on the mechanical properties of tooth-colored restorative materials
	
	There are parts which cause confusion
	- Inconsistency / spelling, such as
	  - specimen vs sample
	  - acid and base cycling vs pH cycling vs pH-storage regimen
	  - Elastic modulus vs (GPa)Elastic modulus vs Flexural modulus
	  - (GPa)Elastic modulus
	
	- different abbreviations for dental materials, such as GR, TEC, CL, TNB, etc, for which all those abbreviations are less well known.
	- different term for a type of dental material, such as
	  - Tetric N Ceram bulk fill / bulk fill restorative composite / Tetric Evo Ceram Bulk Fill / Tetric N- ceram bulk fill (nanohybrid)
	  - GC Fuji II LC (Resin modified glass ionomer cement) / RMGIC / RMGI
	  - Universal nanohybrid Grandio / Grandio / Grandio SO	

Minor REVISION comments	The authors may want to acknowledge to certain parties in relation to this study	
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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Decky J. Indrani***
Department, University & Country	***Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia***