



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 73874

Title: Vertical direction impaction of kissing molars A case report and review of the literature

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05458177

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Indonesia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-12-07

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-12-28 05:18

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-29 06:48

Review time: 1 Day and 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<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
Re-review	<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

Peer-reviewer statements	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

The authors should better describe the rarity of this particular case, compared with previous case reports



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 73874

Title: Vertical direction impaction of kissing molars A case report and review of the literature

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05620806

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: BSc, MSc, PhD

Professional title: Postdoctoral Fellow

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-12-07

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-01-04 18:40

Reviewer performed review: 2022-01-10 05:16

Review time: 5 Days and 10 Hours

Scientific quality	<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
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<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
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No



Peer-reviewer statements	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

Wen et al. in their manuscript entitled “Vertical direction impaction of kissing molars: A case report and review of the literature” aim to specify the definition of kissing molars (KMs) in detail, to facilitate accurate evaluation of their prevalence and reclassify them based on their impaction direction. The authors present a detailed case report of a 25-year-old female that was accidentally diagnosed with two vertically impacted KMs in the left mandible. They first report this type of vertical impacted KMs and have tried to classify KMs by the impacted direction of teeth. The data and findings presented are rigorous enough and justifies the conclusions. The authors have made logical conclusions in a comprehensive manner based on their original findings and have tried to summarize and discuss the available literature in the field. I have tried to list some points that could be revised/discussed by the authors in the manuscript to make it more comprehensible to the reader. 1. Under the history of present illness section, the authors mention that the left maxillary wisdom tooth was extracted but the patient came with complaint about the right maxillary wisdom tooth. Can the authors comment on this? 2. I am a bit confused about the dental numbering system employed in the manuscript, especially regarding number 39, can the authors shed some light on it? 3. “....refused the removal of both KMs and the impacted tooth 48”, why was tooth 48 impaction not discussed in the manuscript? 4. Discussion Paragraph 3: “there is certain error in the incidence statistics”, the statement needs a bit of discussion and detailing. 5. Discussion Paragraph 3: The statement “We believe that the overlapping region of the occlusal surfaces should exceed 90% of the occlusal area of the smaller teeth and the acute angle formed by the long axis of the two teeth should not exceed 30 degrees to be



**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

considered as KMs” needs data to be analyzed from a lot more patients, hence authors should reconsider this claim. 6. Discussion Paragraph 4: “...the included population was not that of ordinary people”, what does the authors mean by this? 7. Discussion Paragraph 5: Last line: et al. or etc.? 8. Why did the authors discuss only Type A KMs? It will be helpful for the readers if all types are discussed.