

Format for ANSWERING REVIEWERS



August 20, 2014

Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed the edited manuscript in Word format (file name: 11949-edited.doc).

Title: Prognostic factors in periodontal therapy and their association with treatment outcomes

Name of Journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

ESPS Manuscript NO: 11949

Invited manuscript with ID: 02908557

The authors did not receive a summary of the reviewer's comment in the Editor's email. We accessed the peer-review website and identified comments from 3 reviewers. Two of the reviewers made favorable comments and accepted the manuscript, thus we thank them. This revision dealt with comments made by a third reviewer.

The reviewer made the following comments:

"Ioannou et al. reviewed the prognostic factors of periodontitis patients using EBM approach. They referred the representative clinical reports and summarized the results with a criticism. Many of classical papers were included in this review, and each summarized results seemed to be pertinent. However, this manuscript also has a problem in the author's criticism throughout the paper. It is ambiguous why the authors selected the papers they discussed here and their conclusions in each section. This problem makes this manuscript as a textbook. If they want to place greater emphasis on scientific merit in this paper, they should conduct this paper as a systematic review or should emphasize their theoretical criticism. Finally, this reviewer concluded this paper needs a major revision before publication. [Minor comments] 1) Please give page numbers, or it is very difficult to provide a comment. 2) Please do not use unnecessary capital letter in the text; "Prognosis, Tooth Loss-----". 3) Please unify the significant digits throughout the text. 4) In Page 11, there appeared the word "McGuire and Nunn (1991) classification". Please state and define this classification when it first appeared."

Some of the reviewer's comments were ambiguous. The reviewer acknowledges that many classical papers have been included, but then criticizes the structure of the paper. As explicitly stated in the text this paper is a critical review and not a systematic review. There are distinct differences between the two types of reviews as well as pros and cons. The numerous systematic reviews that the authors have published are excellent tools for summarizing the current evidence, but a critical review has the purpose of thoughtfully discussing landmark studies and being thought provoking to clinicians and researchers. It is kindly emphasized that this is an invited article and the authors elected to proceed with an expert's opinion type of review.

Additionally, the reviewer has recommended major revision, although as clearly stated in the review his comments are minor. Regarding the minor comments:

1.numbering of the pages, there is no way for the authors to know how the editorial management of this journal converts the submitted manuscripts. This issue should be addressed to the editorial office rather than the authors.

2.No capital letters were found except in titles and subtitles.

3.Significant digits stem from the original articles for reproducibility

4. On page 7 the reader can find the subtitle: **"An evidenced-based attempt to define prognosis: The McGuire & Nunn studies"** The paragraph follows to state: "In 1991 McGuire & Nunn.". The remaining paragraph explicitly discusses the McGuire & Nunn classification.

Also, references and typesetting were corrected as indicated.

Sincerely,

The Authors