

The article was previously reviewed and was given three reviews, shown below. Prior to re-submission, I addressed the comments, such as including tables (review 00742421), ensured the data was reliably obtained from publications a mini-review does not require data analysis but I did compare the data to please reviewer 00467030), and reviewer 00742049 criticized the language quality, so I made simplifications and grammatical corrections:

Specific Comments To Authors (File)

00742421 Conclusion: Accept (High priority)

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade C (A great deal of language polishing)

Recent topic to focus on it. The manuscript is well written, but need to improve methodology and discussion Include some tables of the topic

00467030 Conclusion: Major revision

Scientific Quality: Grade D (Fair)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

This is a clinical relevant min-review paper on the recent hot topic of clinical efficacy of platelet-rich plasma, platelet-rich fibrin, and blood-clot revascularization for the regeneration of immature permanent teeth. The following point needs to be clarified. 1. Please make sure it is a simple mini-review of the data within the selected three papers dealing with clinical efficacy of platelet-rich plasma, platelet-rich fibrin, and blood-clot revascularization for the regeneration of immature permanent teeth; or it is a meta-analysis for these three papers on this issue. If it is a meta-analysis, the data including forest plot, funnel plot and risk of bias need to be performed using specific meta-analysis software (such as RevMan 5.3 software) with the statistical evaluation of significance should be given.

00742049 Conclusion: Rejection

Scientific Quality: Grade D (Fair)

Language Quality: Grade D (Rejection)

This is a concise review of the topic. I could not call it a systematic review as there was not search, inclusion or exclusion criteria for literatures. The levels of evidence of the 3 reviewed studies were also missing. In short, a short review and analysis of three studies does not merit its publication.