



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Research and Reports in Dentistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJRRD_50735
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of the efficiency of light-curing devices used in private dental offices in Tehran in 2016
Type of the Article	Case study

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	The English needs to be improved. It is not acceptable as it is.	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Which radiometer did you use? Was it calibrated? Brands and versions of software and materials should be stated. Standard deviation values should be stated when appropriate. The division into 3 groups should be stated in materials and methods.</p> <p>Line 10: randomly how?! This should be explained in materials and methods. The authors only state there was some kind of randomization in the abstract. Line 94: p/001 – please correct it Line 104: A phrase should not start with numbers. Please add a reference after this phrase: "Also, due to the extensive use of these materials for bonding, the inadequacy of light can affect the bond strength of restorations." (line 116) How many examiners there were? Were they calibrated? Line 132-134: Please revise it. This is not understandable. Line 146: 7/2% ?</p> <p>Discussion is the most frustrating part of the article. It should be improved.</p>	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ana Sofia Coelho
Department, University & Country	University of Coimbra, Portugal