

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Research and Reports in Dentistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJRRD_95814
Title of the Manuscript:	KSK APPPLIANCE- NOVEL METHOD OF REDEFINING SPACE
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:

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

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	It is a case report with a new technique. What is the feasibility and reliability of this technique? Is there any info in the literature? I suggest, due to be a new technique, to do a clinical trial comparing with another or other techniques before to publish a case report. Abstract is incomplete. Please show the results of the study and conclusion. The clinical case needs to be better presented and wirtten DISCUSSION: include discussion about other techniques Include more references	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It is good.	
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Gustavo Fernandes
Department, University & Country	University of Michigan School of Dentistry, USA