



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJAST_17568
Title of the Manuscript:	The influence of immediate dentin sealing techniques on marginal micro leakage of composite resin inlays
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 <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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	Although not original this manuscript is worthwhile publishing as it confirms previous papers. In the title I suggest to use the word efficacy rather than influence. The following comments are mainly to improve dental terms and grammar. Abstract Line 8- "cement-enamel junction" correct to "cemento-enamel junction". Correct in the text where this is used elsewhere. Line 11- correct "provisory restorations" to: "provisional restoration". Line 11-12- "Composite inlays were luted with ED Primer A and B and Panavia F to the preparations.". Authors this sentence is not accurate enough. Do you mean to say that ED Primer A and B were applied to the preparation followed by Panavia F as a luting agent? Please describe it in detail.	Title: We changed the word "influence" to the word "efficacy". Line 8 – We corrected the word. Line 11 – "provisory restoration" was changed to "provisional restoration". Line 11-12: The sentence was rewritten. Line 15 – The magnification was included (30x).



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 15- stereo microscope. At what magnification? Line 16- “penetration along the gingival and axial wall.” Authors it is understood that if axial leakage occurred it has to start at the gingival wall first. A better description would be: “penetration extending into the axial wall”. Materials and Methods State the Ethics committee approval number in the text. Page 3-line 73- “self-cured acrylic resin “. Change to auto polymerizing resin Page 4 – line 77- “high setting speed”. Delete setting	Line 16 – The sentence was changed to “penetration extending into the axial wall”. The Ethics Committe Aproval number was added in the text. “Self-cured acrylic resin” was changed to “auto polymerizing resin”. The word “setting” was deleted. It was used a “digital caliper rule”.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Page 4 – line 85 - paquimeter . This reviewer is not familiar with this word. Do you mean digital micrometer? Page 4 line -132 “-2.500 cycles”. Correct to “2500” cycles. Page 6-line-138- “with cooling”. Change to “with water cooling”. Page 7-Fig. 1. Complete vertical text “quantity” with for instance “of leakage”, or “marginal leakage scores”. Page 8-line 181- “.....removal, followed the Panavia F resin cement application. “: “.....removal, followed by Panavia F resin cement application. “ Page 8-Line 188- “....with a pH close to 2 with	We corrected the number. “With cooling” was changed to “with water cooling”. The vertical text was changed to “Quantity of microleakage scores”. The sentence was changed. The sentence was changed.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	that has a self-etching primer and an adhesive, and a moderate capacity ...". Change to" ...with a pH close to 2. The system has a self-etching primer and an adhesive and a moderate capacity...." Page 9-line 213- " lack of no- adhered surfaces ..." Change to " lack of non-adhered surfaces....."	The sentence was changed.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	NA	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	NA	