

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Dental Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJDS_108069
Title of the Manuscript:	Management of separated instrument with file bypass method: acquainting two case reports.
Type of the Article	Case study

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The case study is an important contribution to the scientific literature. It provides valuable information to clinicians about the management of separated instruments using the bypass method.</p> <p>The title of the manuscript is suitable. It is clear, concise, and informative, and it accurately reflects the content of the manuscript.</p> <p>The abstract is a clear and concise summary of the case study. It is comprehensive enough to be informative to a general audience, but it is also detailed enough to be useful to clinicians who are interested in learning about the management of separated instruments during endodontic treatment.</p> <p>The substructures and sections are appropriate and relevant to the topic.</p> <p>Overall, the manuscript is well-written, scientifically correct, and provides a valuable contribution to the literature on the successful bypass of separated instruments.</p> <p>The references in the manuscript are sufficient and recent. They are from high-quality journals and have been peer-reviewed. They also reflect the latest research on the management of separated instruments during endodontic treatment.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The authors could have included information about the management of instruments separated in the middle third of the root canal.</p>	

### 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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Manu Rathee</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Pt BD Sharma University of Health Sciences, India</b>