



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 72476

**Title:** Intentional Replantation combined Radectomy Therapy for the Treatment of type III Radicular Groove with 2 roots: A case report.

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05486871

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** Doctor, PhD

**Professional title:** Academic Research, Lecturer, Physiotherapist

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Turkey

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-11-12

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-12-03 08:24

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-12-03 15:21

**Review time:** 6 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
-------------------------------------	---

### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

I have reviewed the article entitled "Combined endodontic therapy, intentional replantation and radectomy for treatment of type III radicular groove with two roots: A case report". The manuscript is well-written. Only minor revision given below should be corrected. The last paragraph of the introduction should be moved to case presentation and discussion section, regarding the each statements of the sentences (In this report, we describe a 16-year-old boy with a maxillary lateral incisor with type III radicular groove (deep radicular groove extending to the root apex and with two independent root canals). In this case, a combination of endodontic therapy, intentional replantation, and radectomy was used, resulting in periodontal healing and significant healing of the periradicular radiolucency after 12 mo. At 1-year follow-up, the patient was comfortable and complete resolution of the periapical pathology was evident. In conclusion, intentional replantation combined endodontic and radectomy provides a predictable procedure and should be recognized as a viable treatment modality for the management of type III radicular grooves with two independent root canals.) For instance, the authors should not give the conclusion statements in introduction section.



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 72476

**Title:** Intentional Replantation combined Radectomy Therapy for the Treatment of type III Radicular Groove with 2 roots: A case report.

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 00569747

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** DDS, DSc, MSc, PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** United States

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-11-12

**Reviewer chosen by:** Xin Liu (Online Science Editor)

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-02-28 14:43

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-03-01 16:47

**Review time:** 1 Day and 2 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://www.wjgnet.com**

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] Anonymous [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No
-------------------------------------	---

### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Abstract Conclusion Line 11- "Intentional replantation and radectomy offer a predictable procedure and should be..." Authors, you cannot conclude that your treatment is a predictable procedure since it is only based on the results of one case. See also under Introduction - line 21. Core tip Line 23 - "minimally invasive procedure." This reviewer does not consider your treatment minimally invasive. Please change text.

Case presentation Line 1: Change the text "free previous medical history". For instance: The patient has a negative medical history and denied.....trauma. Treatment Line 22- Replace "required" with "elected" Line 26- Replace segregated with "isolated with rubberdam"

Discussion Line 13- propertiesy Spelling!!

Conclusions Line 1- This reviewer is not sure that animal studies are indicated or feasible. Clinical studies on the other ha d are indicated and mat eventually lead to using the "predictable" treatment.



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 72476

**Title:** Intentional Replantation combined Radectomy Therapy for the Treatment of type III Radicular Groove with 2 roots: A case report.

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 02908703

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** DDS, PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Greece

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-11-12

**Reviewer chosen by:** Xin Liu (Online Science Editor)

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-03-01 07:35

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-03-03 08:58

**Review time:** 2 Days and 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Anonymous [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No
-------------------------------------	---

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The quality of the manuscript is very good. It only needs two small corrections that I have noted in the attached file.



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 72476

**Title:** Intentional Replantation combined Radectomy Therapy for the Treatment of type III Radicular Groove with 2 roots: A case report.

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 02921008

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** DDS

**Professional title:** Academic Research, Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Iran

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-11-12

**Reviewer chosen by:** Xin Liu (Online Science Editor)

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-02-28 15:46

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-03-03 18:44

**Review time:** 3 Days and 2 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] Anonymous [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No
-------------------------------------	---

### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This is an interesting case. Please improve the English grammar, style, and fluency. Possibly, hand the paper to a professional English editor. I see you have complied to the CARE checklist, which is good. But please elaborate even more on every detail of the diagnosis, treatment, outcomes, and follow-ups. So please elaborate more. In the conclusions, please limit this section to the results and avoid deductions or subjective opinions. More pictures would favor the report.



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 72476

**Title:** Intentional Replantation combined Radectomy Therapy for the Treatment of type III Radicular Groove with 2 roots: A case report.

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 00563599

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** DDS, MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Brazil

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-11-12

**Reviewer chosen by:** Xin Liu (Online Science Editor)

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-03-01 23:25

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-03-11 04:50

**Review time:** 9 Days and 5 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No



<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] Anonymous [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No
-------------------------------------	---

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

DEAR AUTHORS, I CONGRATULATE YOU FOR HAVING DONE THE MANUSCRIPT AND AT THE SAME TIME, SEND MY CONSIDERATIONS AND SUGGEST DOING A FURTHER REVISION ON THE FOLLOWING POINTS: TITLE - I RECOMMEND CHANGING THE TITLE (IT DOESN'T NEED TO BE TOO LONG OR REVEAL ALL THE PROCEDURES PERFORMED TO SOLVE THE CLINICAL CASE). CASE SUMMARY - LINE 2: CHANGE WE DESCRIBE BY WE DESCRIBED. - LINE 7: CHANGE WAS USED BY WERE USED. - LINE 8: THE TERM SIGNIFICANT COULD BE INTERPRETED WITH A STATISTICAL CONNOTATION, SO I RECOMMEND ONLY MENTIONING PERIODONTAL/PERIRADICULAR HEALING. - LINE 9: DON'T ABBREVIATE THE WORDS (MONTHS, WEEKS AND DAYS). KEY WORDS - VARIETY OF WORDS NOT FOUND IN THE DeCS/MeSH. INTRODUCTION - LINE 28: FOR RELATIVE DATA I RECOMMEND USING WHOLE NUMBERS WITHOUT DECIMAL. - PAG. 2 LINE 14: CHANGE WE DESCRIBE BY WE DESCRIBED. - REORGANIZE THE LAST PARAGRAPH (YOU COULD MENTION WHAT WAS OBSERVED IN THE CLINICAL CASE BUT IT IS NOT NECESSARY TO MENTION THE RESULTS AND THE CONCLUSION). - PAG. 3 LINE 8: BE CAREFUL WITH THE USE OF THE WORD SIGNIFICANT. DON'T ABBREVIATE MONTHS. CASE PRESENTATION CHIEF COMPLAINT - LINE 27: GIVE MORE DETAILS OF THE PATIENT'S COMPLAINT AT THE TIME OF SEEKING CARE (DID THE PATIENT COMPLAIN OF PAIN, BLEEDING GUMS, SUPPURATION, EATING DISORDERS OR OTHER?) HISTORY OF PRESENT ILLNESS - LINE 29: DON'T ABBREVIATE THE WORD DAY. HISTORY OF PAST ILLNESS - PAG.4 LINE 1: MENTION IF THE



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

PATIENT HAS UNDERGONE PREVIOUS PROCEDURES. PHYSICAL EXAMINATION - LINE 4: I RECOMMEND MENTIONING THAT THERMAL AND ELECTRICAL TESTS WERE PERFORMED TO VERIFY THE PULP SENSITIVITY SINCE IT IS MOST LIKELY THAT THE PULP HAD NECROSED. - LINE 6: REPLACE DEPTH OF PERIODONTAL PROBING BY CLINICAL PROBING DEPTH. - FURTHERMORE CONSIDERING THAT THE MANUSCRIPT WILL BE READ BY A HETEROGENEOUS AUDIENCE (GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE) MENTION IN DETAIL THE INSTRUMENTS USED FOR THE PHYSICAL EXAMINATION. LABORATORY TEST -LINE 9: MENTION THE BLOOD PARAMETERS EVALUATED AS WELL AS THE REFERENCE VALUES USED. IMAGING EXAMINATIONS - LINE 11: WRITE IN FULL CBCT, BECAUSE OTHERWISE IT COULD BE DIFFICULT FOR NON-SPECIALIST READERS TO READ. - GIVE MORE DETAILS OF THE IMAGING FEATURES. - THE QUALITY OF TE TOMOGRAPHIC IMAGES COULD BE IMPROVED (C-D PAG. 12). FINAL DIAGNOSIS - MENTION IN DETAIL THE RADIOGRAPHIC AND CLINICAL FEATURES CONSISTENT WITH THE DEFINITIVE DIAGNOSIS. TREATMENT - LINE 22: REPLACE HOPELESS BY TOOTH WITH QUESTIONABLE PROGNOSIS. - LINE 28: MENTION THE BRANDS OF THE EQUIPMENT USED ACCORDING TO THE STANDARD. - GIVE MORE DETAILS ABOUT THE TREATMENT (TYPE OF INSTRUMENTATION, WORKING COMPLIANCE AND ALL FACTORS THAT COULD HELP IN THE PERFORMANCE OF THE WHOLE TREATMENT BY OTHER PROFESSIONALS). - PAG. 5 LINE 5: THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ARESE: WHAT IS THE PROBABILITY THAT AFTER TWELVE WEEKS THE FISTULA TRACT WILL HAVE CLOSED? JUSTIFY WITH THE LITERATURE. LINE 5: REPLACE DEEP PALATAL POCKET BY CLINICAL PROBING DEPTH. - LINE 9: MENTION BRAND, CONCENTRATION, AND AMOUNT OF THE ANESTHESIA USED. - LINE 21: MORE DETAILS ABOUT THE TYPE OF MATERIAL



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

USED FOR SPLINTING AND WHAT THE OCCLUSAL CONDITION WAS AT THE TIME. - WHY WAS RIGID SPLINTING NOT USED? - LINE 22: MORE DETAILS ABOUT THE ANTIBIOTIC THERAPY. EXPLAIN WHY THE ANTIBIOTIC WAS GIVEN AFTER THE PROCEDURE AND WHY NO ANALGESIC/ANTINFLAMMATORY MEDICATION WAS GIVEN IN ADDITION TO THE DURATION OF EACH RINSE WITH CHLORHEXIDIN. OUTCOME AND FOLLOW-UP - LINE 28: AVOID THE USE OF VAGUE TERMS (EXCELLENT). - LINE 30: AVOID THE ABBREVIATION (MONTHS, WEEKS). - PAG. 6 LINE 1: REPLACE THE DEPTH OF PERIODONTAL PROBE BY CLINICAL PROBING DEPTH. - IS ONE MONTH SUFFICIENT TO RADIOGRAPHICALLY OBSERVE CHANGES IN THE PERIAPICAL/PERIRADICULAR TISSUES? - WHAT WAS THE PATIENT'S ADHERENCE AND TOLERANCE TO THE TREATMENT? - IF THERE WERE ADVERSE EVENTS, MENTION THEM! DISCUSSION - REORGANIZE THE PARAGRAPHS, AS THEY ARE TOO LONG. - IN THE FIRST PARAGRAPH YOU HAVE TO MENTION THE PRIMARY RESULTS AND COMPARE THEM WITH THE EXISTING LITERATURE. - THEN MENTION WHAT THE CLINICAL CASE BRINGS TO THE FIELD AND WHAT THE CLINICAL RELEVANCE IS. MENTION WHAT HAS BEEN DONE BY OTHER AUTHORS. EMPHASIZE THE IMPORTANCE OF RADECTOMY IN TEETH WITH TWO INDEPENDENT ROOTS. JUSTIFY WHY GUIDED TISSUE REGENERATION WAS NOT USED IN CONJUNCTION WITH REIMPLANTATION. WHAT ARE THE TECHNICAL, CLINICAL LIMITATIONS AND ADVERSE EVENTS DURING THE RESOLUTION OF THE CLINICAL CASE? - FOCUS THE DISCUSSION ON YOUR CLINICAL CASE. CONCLUSION - REORGANIZE IT SINCE IT SHOULD MEET THE OBJECTIVE OF THE CLINICAL CASE PRESENTATION. REFERENCES - REVIEW REFERENCES, THERE ARE SOME REPEATED (12/25, 13/17)



**RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT**

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 72476

**Title:** Intentional Replantation combined Radectomy Therapy for the Treatment of type III Radicular Groove with 2 roots: A case report.

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer’s code:** 00563599

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** DDS, MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer’s Country/Territory:** Brazil

**Author’s Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-11-12

**Reviewer chosen by:** Ze-Mao Gong

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-03-30 14:05

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-04-01 12:25

**Review time:** 1 Day and 22 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Peer-reviewer</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://www.wjgnet.com**

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

DEAR AUTHORS, I ALSO REQUEST THE CORRECTION OF SOME TOPICS: - IN THE ABSTRACT I RECOMMEND NOT TO WRITE ABBREVIATED TERMS. - CHANGE KEY WORDS (SOME OF THOSE INSERTED DO NOT EXIST EN DECS). - REVISE THE LANGUAGE AND CORRECT SOME TYPING AND SPELLING MISTAKES (WORD MONTH, WEEK, IN ORDER). - STANDARDIZE TERMS REGARDING CLINICAL PROBING DEPTH. - DO NOT ABBREVIATE THE TERM GBR (AT LEAST THE FIRST TIME, QUOTE IN FULL).