



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_38834
Title of the Manuscript:	Hygroscopic expansion influence on cuspal deflection of tooth composite restoration
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	The author considered combining P90 SILOANE, which is a siloxane and oxirane devirated compound, and this is totally incompatible with methacrylate derivates like 4-MET contained in G-BOND from GC, is there any justification in the use of this combined self-etch bonding system with a silorane derivated composite resin?	In fact, the result of our study supported your opinion where G-Bond recorded the highest cusp deflection with both of composite materials. In addition the two materials already used in previous study by Labib et.al in 2015 and they did not mention any incompatibility. Labib Mohamed Labib, Sameh Mahmoud Nabih1, Kusai Baroudi, J. of Int. Soc. of Prev. and Com. Dentistry; Evaluation of cuspal deflection in premolar teeth restored with low shrinkable resin composite ,2015, IP: 93.169.240.143
Minor REVISION comments	Line 40 correct the points followed by commas Line 57 Aim of the Study: Just write "To evaluate <i>in vitro</i> effect of hygroscopic expansion on the cusp deflection of tooth composite restorations". Correct every "in vitro" to <i>in vitro</i> with cursive letter. DISCUSSION: There is a lot of evidence about the reduced polymerization shrinkage of P90, but in the discussion there is nothing about the polymerization shrinkage stress (PSS), which are not the same. Many conclusions exist about the PSS being the same and happening in the internal walls of the cavities. Something about this might be helpful to understand better the differences about PS and PSS, and how this phenomenon generates other different reactions like cuspal deflection, tooth sensitivity, secondary caries, and microleakage. Line 121 of the discussion. (Filtek z350 P90 which bonded with... That must be corrected) Line 122 grammar corrections needed to understand the idea. The Title of the manuscript talks about "hygroscopic expansion". There is still a lack of information about this in the discussion. Still need to be worked, define the physical phenomena and how this produces some adverse effects in tooth structure. REFERENCES Need to change all to the journal format. There are different formats. TABLE 1 Filtek Adhesive?, which one is this? Please inform.	Thanks for your valuable notes. They are corrected. - More explanation done and highlighted. - Corrected - Added - performed - explained
Optional/General comments		