

Review of: "Relationship between In Vitro Physical Properties and In Situ Biofilm Formation of Fissure Sealants"

Tania Vanessa Pierfelice¹

¹ University of Chieti-Pescara

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The study was carried out using four different materials and standardized samples on human enamel, and taking into account the obtained results, this study might have clinical interest.

It's in my opinion that the study requires minor revision. The study should be revised as I stated below, along with my reasons. I would like to point out that the work can be evaluated in your journal by making as many revisions as possible.

Abstract:

I propose that the abstract should include a clear conclusion that supports the assertion in the title and demonstrates the material's advantages over other current bone grafts. Also, the abstract should include a clear clinical point of view.

Introduction:

The first part of the introduction lacks some references. I suggest including more study examples in the introduction.

Materials and Methods:

It will be more useful for the readers if the purpose of the analysis is briefly written in Section 2.1.

Results:

1. For the Roughness Test, I recommend adding the following points. How was the surface preparation done before the test? At what speed and under what pressure was it used during the measurement?
2. Scale information should be clearly presented in the images obtained in the SEM analysis. You must ensure this. It's in the images, but it's not readable.

Discussion:

The discussion was well written and coherent with the abstract and the introduction. However, the discussion should be enriched by including more previous study examples to magnify the findings in this study. Limitations of the findings and suggestions for future research should be also included in this section.

