



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_46904
Title of the Manuscript:	INCIDENCE OF RESTORATION REPLACEMENT IN SOUTH-CANARA POPULATION - AN EPIDEMIOLOGICAL SURVEY
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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>This is a hard-to-follow manuscript. The interpretations of the authors for their data are invalid. The manuscript requires thorough editing before it may be evaluated. Below the authors can find my critical points:</p> <p>1) Abstract</p> <p>--Methodology: "...size and class of the restoration, reason for the failure, type and position of the tooth, anamnesis of the respective tooth." size? position? anamnesis? these are not mentioned in the study.</p> <p>--Results: The exact number of included patients is required.</p> <p>--Results: No mention of the results of the statistical analysis (chi-square) can be found.</p> <p>--Conclusion: It also indicated that replacements were more prevalent ... for individuals brushing once daily in comparison with those brushing twice daily What about the occasionally-brushing patients?</p> <p>2) Introduction</p> <p>--Last sentence. Not general population, it is South Canara population.</p> <p>3) Material and Methods</p> <p>-- First paragraph: "...over a period of three months from May 15th 2018 –June 15th 2018". It is not 3 months.</p> <p>4) Results</p> <p>--Table 1 and 2 is unnecessary. Their content may be given in the text.</p> <p>--" Incidence was found more in males with a percentage of 59.3% whereas females consisted of 40.6%." Instead of these numbers, the numbers that matter are those in the Table 3. For example, it must be written like this: 19.6% of the males and 16.5% of the females required restoration replacement.</p> <p>-- The comment above also holds true for the age group, and the frequency of brushing. "The most significant age groups came out to be 30-45(33.5%) and 45-60 (39.8%)." is not true. In fact, 45-60 age group is the group that presents the greatest percentage of restoration replacement need (33.4%; see Table 3).</p> <p>--All Tables lack a heading.</p> <p>--Table 4, add Total rows</p> <p>-- Figure 1 is repetitive. Omit Figure 1</p> <p>-- Table 5, add Total also for the columns</p> <p>-- Table 5, What does the p value mean? They are not described in the Results section. What should one understand by seeing those p values?</p> <p>-- Figure 2, name the y-axis (as percentage)</p> <p>5) References</p> <p>-- The references list does not match with the main text, wrong referencing style, repetitive references</p>	Incorporated the changes.
Minor REVISION comments		
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)	