



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>Introduction part</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - should be arranged systematically that showed the historical background of the purpose of this research - Need to be written more clearly the meaning of "Largely, the replacements account for a major portion than the primary restorations in routine clinical practice" - Need to be written more clear for this statement higher age of restoration at replacement is related to normal occlusal function. Likewise reduction in the restoration's age is associated with extreme occlusal function <p>Material and metnod part:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - explain the meaning of "failure to consent did not affect the patients' treatment and confidentiality of the information given was assured. - After the tooth isolation, patients were examined for restoration replacement and a questionnaire was set to record the history linked to the failure of restoration - Quadrant affected :1. First 2. Second 3. Third 4. Fourth. (described each location) <p>Result part:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - third (34.06%) and fourth (35.16%) quadrants showed more replacements. Whereas first quadrant showed only 6.04 % and Second quadrant 24.7 % <p>Conclusion part:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Amalgam was more commonly replaced than composite and Glass ionomers → need to be added with the statement "With the exception glass ionomer alone of Class V restoration " 	
Minor REVISION comments	The columns of the table should be arranged that each column has each title more neatly	
Optional/General comments	This manuscript need to be revised as mentioned above	

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:	Janti Sudiono
Department, University & Country	Trisakti University, Indonesia