SCIENCEDOMAIN international

www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Dental Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJDS_58638
Title of the Manuscript:	BICUSPISATION: A HOPE FOR THE HOPELESS
Type of the Article	Case study

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		Thermal resultation of
	Review term "Bicuspidization in title and all along the article. This is not a regularly used term in periodontology. Suggested Title below. Lots of English corrections to be made. I've pointed out some below, with mark ups. Must say that the patient had no periodontal disease, that it was an endoperio lesion, after pulpal necrosis. Was the patient systemically healthy? Did he smoke? How was his oral hygiene condition? Must include recent references. Included some below. Must emphasize in discussion pros and cons of the technique and why it should be made instead of dental implants. Considering it's a young patient, with no periodontal disease and a bone loss in the furcation area secondary to a pulpal necrosis, do you think you could wait a while and see bone formation in the furcation area after the treatment? Why did you choose the ressective procedure in a young patient, immediately after root canal treatment? You should discuss this. Did you give the patient options? Why did he prefer this treatment? Discuss alternatives.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)

SCIENCEDOMAIN international www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alessandra Areas E Souza
Department, University & Country	Brazil

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)