

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_122825
Title of the Manuscript:	A cone-beam computed tomographic study to evaluate variations in root canal morphology of mandibular premolars and its relation to mental foramen
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

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.	A multi-center study aiming at showing the variations in mandibular premolars in regard to their roots number and shape and at their relationship with the mental foramen in some indian population. It is not very important clinically because the authors say that only a CBCT will reveal properly those matters and therefore it is not very convenient nor ethical to ask a CBCT for every endodontic treatment one will perform. There are sufficient statistical numbers in the literature that can help regarding this matter.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes in general . Maybe just specify the population origin.	
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.	Abstract is ok for this manuscript. It might need to be corrected after the major corrections.	
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.	This manuscript has the scientific structure. It lacks a major rewriting of the materials and methods and the results.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Sufficient? It is not the number that counts rather than the quality and type. Not really new and some recent references might help.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes to my knowledge	
Optional/General comments	Manuscripts needs a major revision especially to rewrite the materials and methods and some of the results. The CBCTs come from different centers. Are those centers using the same radiological and software equipment? ARre they calibrated? If not, one cannot compare the CBCTs. Why the CBCTs were taken initailly? How many were reviewed before reaching the 250 needed? Put all the reasons for asking a CBCT. The ethical committee approved the protocol: where is the approval? The details given are not accesible. There is a confusion for the reader between the number 250 CBCTs and the number of premolars. The 250 CBCTs showed how many first and second premolars? It is not clear whether the authors are considering 250 premolars or CBCTs and it is confusing. The results are not clear. Table 1 addition gives 245 items not 250.	

Review Form 3

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:	Jose Johann Chidiac
Department, University & Country	Lebanese University,Lebanon