

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Research and Reports in Dentistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJRRD_94983
Title of the Manuscript:	NATURE'S CURE – BIOMIMETICS FOR APEXIFICATION
Type of the Article	Case report

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:

(<https://www.journalijrrd.com/index.php/IJRRD/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>NO, because it is an ordinary subject and MTA is routinely used in dental offices for apexification. This article has reported the application of this material for apexification.</p> <p>yes</p> <p>yes</p> <p>yes</p> <p>No, needs additional references</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The subject of the article (the application of MTA for apexification) is very ordinary subject that dentists see every day. However, the article states the stages of apexification treatment and the tooth restoration very well and from the educational aspect it can be useful and instructive for dental students and for recent-graduated dentist who seek for such information. Thus, the decision about publishing such kind of case report which does not report a rare entity and is more instructive, is totally depend on the journal policy.</p> <p>About the discussion part:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- More explanation and references are needed where the authors state that "Because apex locators have shown inconsistent findings in open apices, working length was determined using the paper point approach in this case report following access preparation". 2- More explanation with relevant references are required about irrigation with NaOCl. 3- It is highly recommended to bring a reference where authors state that " obturation was accomplished with thermoplasticized gutta-percha, which may be applied without applying any compaction stresses on thin dentinal walls". 	

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:	Mitra Karbasi Kheir
Department, University & Country	Iran