SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JMSRR_41397**
Title of the Manuscript:	**EFFECT OF DIFFERENT ETCHING TIME ON BOND STRENGTH OF COMPOSITE RESIN TO DENTIN**
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)

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	MATERIAL AND METHOD: Line 59: How was the sample size established? . Line 59: The dentine of a molar of a young person is not the same as that of an adult, so a tooth extracted for periodontal reasons is not the same as one extracted for orthodontic reasons. The sample is not homogeneous. Line 66: what type of bur and what grain size was used? You should describe the type and name of manufacturer Line 73: Was some type of randomization established to form the groups? Line 80: What type of adhesive was used? Line 81: what light cure composite resin was used? Line 82: the area over which the composite resin was placed has not been determined. The strength of union will depend on the size of the adhered area. RESULTS: Line 108: No reference is made to the statistical test used (parametric-non-parametric) and which type of test. DISCUSSION: No discussion of the results obtained in this work with other works carried out by other authors. This study is not very novel, there are many others of the same characteristics. Actually it does not bring any new results. CONCLUSIONS: all the conclusions comment on the smear layer present or not in the dentin as well as the disposition of the dentinal tubules and no such conclusions can be affirmed in this study since it is not a microscopic study. REFERENCES: The most current reference is from 2014. There are more current articles that should be present in a study like this.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Jesus Oteo Calatayud***
Department, University & Country	***Department of Odontología Conservadora and Prótesis Bucofacial, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Spain***