

Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Dental Sciences |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJDS_83187 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Title: Management of Pulpally Involved Primary Teeth With Triple Antibiotic Paste – Review and Case Series |
| Type of the Article | Case study |

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

(<https://www.journalajds.com/index.php/AJDS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

| | 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) |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| Compulsory REVISION comments | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Title need to be reframed as the procedure used in the these cases does not depict pulpotomy or LSTR. Justify ? 2. This is not a case series as only three cases are presented. Case series usually includes five or more than five cases 3. Key words need to be added/modified as per the manuscript 4. Brief about the presentation of the cases and treatment done at the end of introduction 5. Clinical procedure described in the review is not correct. Kindly follow the literature 6. As TAP was modified early to reduce the side effects. Why modified composition of TAP was not used in these cases? Justify 7. Review need to be reframed as most of the literature and procedure related to intercanal medicament 8. Case 1 how radiographic examination helps in tendor on percussion. Justify 9. Past dental history was missing 10. Procedure done is pulpotomy or LSTR. If pulpotomy was chosen why coronal 5mm of root canals was instrumented. Justify 11. Tell the difference between the internal root resorption and interradicular resorption ? 12. Why only GIC was chosen as final restoration? why not two layered restoration GIC and composite restoration as final restoration 13. In case 2 what the reason of mobility? Was there any abscess ? 14. Post op IOPA was missing in case 2. | |
| Minor REVISION comments | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All three cases not isolated as per the standardized procedure. 2. Wrong diagnosis as internal root resorption were made in all the three cases. 3. All three cases with same diagnosis but radiographic examination did not show any internal root resorption 4. Radiographs are without rubberdam clamps ? how the isolation was achieved in all the three cases 5. Discussion should be more about the techniques not antibiotics 6. "Replacement of minocycline with clindamycin or doxycycline can overcome this problem." Which problem are you discussing ? | |
| Optional/General comments | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Grammatical mistakes 2. References need to be modified | |

Review Form 1.6

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: | Neeraj Kumar |
| Department, University & Country | All India Institute of Medical Sciences (AIIMS), Bilaspur, India |