

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Research and Reports in Dentistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJRRD_125420
Title of the Manuscript:	management of a radicular cyst associated with a pulpectomised primary molar followed by bonded space regainer for eruption of premolar– A case report
Type of the Article	Case report

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)
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.	This case explains pathology and management very well. However, outcome analysis criteria for primary teeth should be added to the discussion part criticising the methodology adopted.	
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.	The indication for opting for this procedure should be discussed with references and help to develop evidence-based practice.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No, the frequent spacing should be corrected.	
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.	Technically, the case is common but the management is something that gains attention. The follow-up period is very little to comment on the success rate where comes the importance of treatment outcome analysis guidelines given by various associations that should be added.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, The guidelines to be mentioned which will add on to a few references.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Can be re-phrased.	
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:	Simran Kriplani
Department, University & Country	Datta Meghe Institute of Higher Education and Research, India