

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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>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.</p>	<p>The success of endodontic treatment is influenced by the clinician's knowledge of morphology and possible variations of the root canal system, as well as its cleaning, instrumentation, and adequate filling. The obstacles to achieving such goals are closely linked to the complexity of root canal anatomy such as roots and supernumerary canals, root dilaceration, isthmus, ramifications, apical deltas, C-shaped canals, and flattening, which are more common in the lower arch. This article discusses the teeth with the highest prevalence of root canal variation which are the premolars.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is misleading. The suggested title should reflect the narrow sub-group in whom the study was carried out. Alternative title suggested is: A cone-beam computed tomographic study to evaluate variations in root canal morphology of mandibular premolars and its relation to mental foramen in an Indian sub-population</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The study has defined the population and the methodology of the study. The study has described the sample size estimation, inclusion & exclusion criteria The study has described the procedures followed to arrive at a conclusion.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Few relevant references have been omitted. Examples are: (i) Pang KC, Raja KK, Nambiar P. A comparative study on man dibular premolar root canal morphology employing cone-beam computed tomography and microcomputed tomography imaging. J Conserv Dent 2022; 25: 173-8. (ii) Sousa TO, Haiter-Neto F, Nascimento EH, Peroni LV, Freitas DQ, Hassan B. Diagnostic accuracy of periapical radiography and cone-beam computed tomography in identifying root canal configuration of human premolars. J Endod 2017; 43: 1176-9.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes; adequate</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>(i) It is necessary to describe the approaches followed to ensure validity and. reliability. (ii) No limitations of the study or methodology followed have been listed (iii) Since scans of CBCT were acquired from five distinct CBCT centres, there is no mention if there was any possibility of bias due to different machines used and possible differences in magnification</p>	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Oommen Nainan
Department, University & Country	India