

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_82332
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE EVALUATION OF CRESTAL BONE LOSS AROUND COMPRESSION SCREW IMPLANTS PLACED IN HEALED SITES AND FRESHLY EXTRACTED SOCKETS
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### **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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The article seems organized at a glance but it requires major considerations. Results and discussion do not provide enough information and do not show the importance of this study. I also suggest authors refine the language and grammar of the manuscript. There are many long sentences that are confusing for readers. The following are detailed descriptions of the concerns about this article:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In the abstract, conclusion part, please describe why these one-piece implants are considered as an appropriate model.</li> <li>2. In the introduction, please provide more information about implant stability and the position of implant in the surrounding bone.</li> <li>3. In surgical procedure please provide more information about the screw type that was used with consideration of the material.</li> <li>4. How many implants were inserted in mandible and how many in maxilla?</li> <li>5. What parameters are measured in this study? For example, is vertical distance between implant shoulder and bone crest measured? Please clarify these parameters in text.</li> <li>6. In the result section, did you observe any complications requiring surgical intervention or antibiotic therapy? Please mention this issue in your manuscript.</li> <li>7. In the discussion, there is no information about why mentioned results have happened. It just provides some information about other research groups that are not relevant to discussion part. This part needs to be rewritten.</li> <li>8. The conclusion is too short and is focusing on one-piece implant advantages. However, based on article title, the aim of this study is not the effect of one-piece implant on missing teeth.</li> <li>9. The authors have aimed to evaluate crestal bone loss around compression screw implants placed in healed sites and freshly extracted sockets. The manuscript needs some revisions before being accepted for publication.</li> <li>10. A brief synopsis of the work should be included at the last paragraph of the introduction.</li> <li>11. No mention is made to delayed implant placement in the surgical procedure section.</li> <li>12. The authors should give further explanation on novelty of the study.</li> <li>13. The authors should give further explanation on "inclusion section" and also present some future aspects for their research.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		

Review Form 1.6

<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Need to improve the English language. There are many paragraphs that need to be rewritten. for example:” For many years, the use of the original Branemark dental implants system in the rehabilitation followed a protocol of implant submersion for 3-6 months during osseointegration for uneventful healing and to avoid implant micro movement around the bone-implant interface during the healing phase which may influence fibrous tissue formation instead of osseointegration, leading to implant failure,” It is too long and confusing for reader.</li><li>2. There are some type and grammar errors in the manuscript. For example, introduction section (page 2 line 6) “it is less time consuming”, materials and methods section (page 2 line 9) “atleast”, surgical procedure section (page 2 line 6) “pre-requisite”, discussion section (page 4 line 9)“longterm”. The manuscript should be checked in this regard.</li><li>3. In the surgical procedure section, some sentences is written in the simple past passive form and some of them in the simple present passive form. Use the same form for sentences</li><li>4. Correct authors name. For example, introduction section (page 1 line 18 and 19) “Schincaglia GP [8]” and “Barewal RM [9]” should be replaced by “Schincaglia [8]” and “Barewal et al. [9]”. The manuscript should be checked in this regard.</li><li>5. Avoid long paragraphs in order to make it easier to read. for example, introduction section (page 1 line 4) “For many years, the use of the original Branemark dental implants system in the rehabilitation followed a protocol of implant submersion for 3-6 months during osseointegration for uneventful healing and to avoid implant micro movement around the bone-implant interface during the healing phase which may influence fibrous tissue formation instead of osseointegration, leading to implant failure”, discussion section (page 4 line 12)“Although studies conducted by Aparicio et al [4] and Chow et al [19] reported that immediate loading may be unpredictable with poor bone qualities, consequently improvements in implant design and surface patterns have demonstrated encouraging results for immediately loaded non-splinted [20,21] and splinted implants placed in regions with non-optimal bone quality and also reported that immediate loading implants have more bone to implant contact with more mature cortical bone than delayed loaded implants [22,23]”</li><li>6. The authors should pay attention to the FONT of manuscript that should be “Times New Romans” with the size of 12.</li><li>7. This sentence needs reference/references “The prolonged nature of the waiting period before loading raised concerns about treatment length and is sometimes the reason for not choosing implant supported restorations”</li><li>8. In the Table 1. The authors reported two lengths for one diameter, how about “4.1mm × 15mm”.</li><li>9. The authors should give further explanation, analysis, and figures in the “result section” about the structure of implants.</li><li>10. The authors used less than 30 references and also did not applied the novel references. Please increase the references up to 30 ones. Also 30% of them should be related to the recent 3 years ago so improve the references by these suggested ones: <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnoncrysol.2021.120740">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnoncrysol.2021.120740</a> <a href="https://doi.org/10.29252/jcc.2.1.4">https://doi.org/10.29252/jcc.2.1.4</a> <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.carbpol.2021.118631">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.carbpol.2021.118631</a> <a href="https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs12633-018-0063-2">https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs12633-018-0063-2</a> <a href="https://doi.org/10.52547/jcc.3.4.5">https://doi.org/10.52547/jcc.3.4.5</a></li></ol>	
---	--	--

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Parisa Shafiee</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University Science of Technology, Iran</b>