

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_124767
Title of the Manuscript:	Platelet-rich fibrin associated with laser biostimulation in the treatment of multiple recessions: a randomized, double-blind clinical study.
Type of the Article	

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.	LLLT is a trending safe treatment modality with a lot of untapped potential so any research suggesting its application for the betterment of regeneration is worth publishing.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	YES	
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.	YES	
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.	Overall the manuscript is very well written with No change warranted in the entire article , There is however one flaw in the periodontal science which can be rectified with a reply which must be mentioned in the discussion or Introduction – Recession and recession management is very site specific so recession in the maxillary anteriors with a superior Biotype, altered bone form and enhanced vasculature cannot be compared with a maxillary molar with limited surgical access or mandibular incisors with poor Biotype or bicuspid. THEY ARE NOT EVEN COMPARABLE so trying to use obtained values for standardisation and justification with BIostatistics IS NOT POSSIBLE.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	YES, they are recent and up to date.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments	YES	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	<p>+Inclusion Criteria states "Cairo type 1 gingival recession in at least one arch" however study type is split mouth kindly change this to "at least 2 arches"</p> <p>+Exclusion Criteria please add "Connective tissue Disorders"</p> <p>+ There is no standardized means to measure Keratinized Tissue Width- so kindly mention how it was standardized in the study using puncture with a probe or an endodontic reamer??</p> <p>+In Laser application protocol for LLT one of the variables is distance so it does not have to be very accurate but mention "the distance at which LLT was performed in Non-Contact mode in approximate mm from the surgical site/ or as close to the surgical site as possible"</p> <p>+There is no standardization of the recession site as different sites results are not comparable - Incisors and canine can not be compared to bicuspid and molars & maxilla results can't be compared to mandible due to inherent difference in anatomy- so kindly mention "Same teeth were selected on Contralateral arch and test sites" OR PROVIDE A JUSTIFICATION WHY SITE IS IRRELEVANT IN RECESSION MANAGEMENT AS PER THE AUTHORS WITH A REFERENCE</p> <p>+This is not incorrect but it is scientifically better to just write (p>0.05) than A 5% significance level was used for all analyses. As per the author's choice.</p> <p>+In Conclusion – There was no statistical significance between both groups however, the author may mention any clinical Improvement which may have been perceived like 'LLT group clinically showed increased width of keratinized tissue/buccal recession coverage which was insignificant statistically'</p> <p>This is because every clinically significant observation cannot always be proved statistically as a minor improvement is still a relevant improvement .</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Siddharth Narayan
Department, University & Country	Saveetha Institute of Medical and Technical Sciences, India