

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Research and Reports in Dentistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJRRD_127537
Title of the Manuscript:	Microsurgical Coronally Advanced Flap Technique with Platelet-Rich Fibrin and Hyaluronic Acid Gel for Gingival Recession Coverage: A Case Report
Type of the Article	Case report

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The study is well-written and demonstrates a clear flow, but some sections could benefit from more scientific rigor (e.g., quantitative data, detailed methodology).	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title is not appropriate. It does not give emphasis on the main surgical procedure planned. Alternate title, "Microsurgical localised gingival recession coverage using coronally advanced flap with platelet rich fibrin and hyaluronic acid: A case report"	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	There is no mention of cause of gingival recession. The term "healthy pocket depths" is academically wrong. Mention of various surgical techniques is vague as it is classified on the basis of different factors. There is direct mention of palatal donor site without mentioning the technique it is utilised in like free gingival graft.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	It lacks mentions of different surgical techniques and their drawbacks. It states emphasis on width of keratinised tissue but the technique used does not alter the width. There is no mention of common causes of gingival recession in the entire manuscript. There is no mention of periodontitis in the entire manuscript, which is the most common cause and most important entity to be discussed. It states adequate width of keratinised gingiva but has no supporting pictures of measurements. The instruments used are not properly mentioned. Ophthalmic blades, even though used for microsurgical procedures, are never considered as microsurgical blades itself. There is no mention of the type of ophthalmic blade used. Images used are not of good quality and standards. PRF making technique is not explained with scientific correctness. After suture application, prf is not supposed to be exposed in the oral cavity. The incision design could have been better as it shows over-manipulation of flap. Suturing techniques in not named and mentioned vaguely. Post operative medication is not scientifically correct.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	Yes	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language can be enhanced to make it more scientifically relevant.	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Prince Soni
Department, University & Country	Govt. College of Dentistry, India