



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 (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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1) The manuscript is well- written and the design study is also proper. However, some explanation could have been done regarding the restoration used in the luting procedures (It was not possible to understand where these restorations came from. Are they the same material as the provisional ones? If so, please state that. If not, what was the used material?). 2) Why was a ceramic primer used if the restoration was from Filtek Z250 (which is a resin composite material). This 'ceramic primer' is only mentioned in Table 1, but nowhere else? Was any ceramic used? If so, when? This should have been described in the text. 3) Who make the scoring of the samples under stereomicroscope? Was it one observer? Two? If it was one, how was this observer calibrated? If there were more than one, was there any statistical agreement between them? If not, if both disagree regarding a specific score, how was this evaluated? 4) If all the observations were performed under a stereomicroscope, some photographs should have been	The composite resin Z250 was used to build the composite inlays (line 111). In line 121, the sentence "The fitting surface of the restoration..." was changed to " The fitting surface of the composite inlay..." We did not use ceramic restorations, only composite restorations. Ceramic primer is used with ceramic because it bonds chemically the ceramic and the resinous material. However, the ceramic primer also has the capacity to improve surface wettability, causing better contact and infiltration of the resinous material in irregularities of the restorative material. This is the main reason why we used ceramic primer on composite inlays. One experienced examiner evaluated the microleakage scores under stereomicroscope. This information was added in the text (line 144).



SDI Review Form 1.6

	included, showing 'score 1', 'score 0' and so on. I strongly suggest that the authors include some photographs, since all the results are based on scoring of dye penetration and no photographs are shown of this scoring or the dye penetration. Also, better explanation of who was the evaluator (and how was the calibration of this evaluation) and the scoring should have been performed in the text.	Unfortunately, the camera of the stereomicroscope was not working properly at the time of the study. The observation of the microleakage score was done directly in the stereomicroscope, and no photographs were obtained. We have photos from another study, but it would not be correct to include photos from another research.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		