

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 74066

Title: Management of type IIIb dens invaginatus using a combination of root canal treatment, intentional replantation, and surgical therapy: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06104963

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: DDS, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Turkey

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-12-17

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-12-18 13:15

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-18 15:00

Review time: 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input 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

1. The title reflects the main subject. 2. The abstract summarizes and reflects the work described in the manuscript. 3. The keywords reflect the focus of the manuscript. 4. In the first sentence of the second paragraph of the Introduction (lines 18 and 19): I suggest giving reference to this sentence: "The most widely known classification of DI into three types was made by Oehler in 1957." 5. If any medication such as anti-inflammatory, antibiotic, mouthwash etc. usage was administered to the patient after the first intentional replantation, I recommend adding it to the Methods section. In addition, under the title of "surgical treatment", was an antibiotic usage recommended after the swelling occurred in the patient or was the surgery performed directly? In my opinion, it is important to inform not only the endodontic treatment, but also the medications applied at which stage and in what dose. 6. Discussion part is well written. Maybe in the discussion section; A sentence or two can be added about which clinical failure in DIs should be decided by tooth extraction instead of endodontic treatment. 7. In figures, arrows can be used to show the boundaries of the lesion. 8. Language and grammar accurate and appropriate. 9. References support the study and are relevant, but not very up-to-date. I suggest you support your work with a few references from 2021 and 2020. 10. The authors prepared the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods as case report. 11. Patient informed consent was obtained in Chinese. Although I do not understand the extent of Chinese informed consent, the manuscript generally meets ethical requirements.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 74066

Title: Management of type IIIb dens invaginatus using a combination of root canal treatment, intentional replantation, and surgical therapy: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05280548

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: DDS, MSc

Professional title: Lecturer, Research Fellow

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Brazil

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-12-17

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-01-02 01:23

Reviewer performed review: 2022-01-02 01:47

Review time: 1 Hour

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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" 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: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No
-------------------------------------	---

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript is well written, However, I recommend a copyediting by an expert author. My major concern about this case is: why did not proceed to apicoectomy before the intentional replantation?? As endodontist, I would choose apicoectomy before the intentional replantation as alternative. The conclusion is too vague. It should be more objective.