

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_129759
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Analysis Of Autologous Scaffold Formation Protocols In Regenerative Endodontic Therapy: A Systematic Review And Meta-Analysis
Type of the Article	Systematic Review

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Regenerative endodontics is an essential and fascinating subject in the field of endodontics. The future of the field is likely to focus more on regeneration rather than repair through traditional methods. Highlighting the importance of autogenous scaffolds through a systematic review of randomized controlled trials makes a valuable contribution to the advancement of endodontics	
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 its comprehensive	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	yes, it is correct	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	yes, it is sufficient	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>yes, it is suitable</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The authors have undertaken a significant and timely study addressing autologous scaffold formation protocols in regenerative endodontic therapy. The systematic review and meta-analysis are well-conducted and adhere to established methodologies. However, several areas require improvement to enhance the manuscript’s clarity, rigor, and applicability.</p> <p>Key Comments:</p> <p>?? PRISMA Checklist: The authors are requested to provide a completed PRISMA checklist to ensure transparency and compliance with systematic review guidelines. This will help readers assess the methodological robustness of the study.</p> <p>?? Rationale and Objectives: The rationale for conducting this review needs to be more specific and clearly articulated. The authors should explicitly state the objectives of the study and ensure these objectives align with the presented findings.</p> <p>?? Take-Home Message: The manuscript should clearly articulate the clinical and research implications of the review. Emphasize how the findings advance current knowledge or improve clinical practice in regenerative endodontic therapy.</p> <p>?? Comparison with Existing Reviews: Highlight how this review differs from other published reviews on the same topic. Clearly emphasize its unique contributions and value to the field.</p> <p>?? Limitations and Bias: Provide a more detailed discussion on how risks of bias and heterogeneity were addressed during the review. Explain the potential impact of these factors on the results and their interpretation.</p> <p>?? Biological Factors in Outcomes:</p> <p>a?? Explain how Platelet-Rich Plasma (PRP) and Platelet-Rich Fibrin (PRF) contribute to better outcomes in root lengthening. Provide a clear, evidence-based explanation of their role in promoting cell proliferation, differentiation, and vascularization.</p> <p>b?? Clarify why blood clots are associated with superior apical healing. Discuss their biological role in creating an environment conducive to tissue regeneration and healing.</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>The manuscript requires *MAJOR REVISIONS* to address the points above. Once these issues are resolved, the study will make a valuable contribution to the field of regenerative endodontics.</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Ajay Chhabra</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>All India Institute of Medical Sciences, India</p>