

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Dental Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJDS_97765
Title of the Manuscript:	A COMPREHENSIVE TREATMENT APPROACH FOR CHRONIC GENERALIZED PERIODONTITIS WITH PLAQUE-INDUCED GINGIVAL ENLARGEMENT- CASE REPORT
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.journalajds.com/index.php/AJDS/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)	1. Yes 2. Yes 3. An abstract is often presented separately from the article, so it must be able to stand alone. Hence the problem statement, aim, novelty and results of the study must be all included. 4. Yes 5. There is a lack of innovative description of this study. It is suggested to add the similarities and differences between this results, and what supplements and developments have been made. 6. Yes A more critical discussion of benefit, pitfalls and threats connected in the use of these type of techniques.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The authors need to address several grammar and language issues. Please read and revise the whole paper in terms of language. It should be checked by a native English speaker as it is hard for the readers to follow or understand the paper.	
Optional/General comments	The content of the conclusion should reflect the practical value and applicable scope of the results, and can put forward suggestions or prospects. Should not resemble abstract, conclusion needs to revise.	

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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Cheng Hock Chuah
Department, University & Country	University of Malaya, Malaysia