

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 86053

**Title:** Comparison of five-year outcomes of immediate implant placement for mandibular molars with chronic apical periodontitis and those without obvious inflammation: a retrospective study

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 00742340

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** DDS, PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor, Doctor, Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-05-29

**Reviewer chosen by:** Geng-Long Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-06-09 00:06

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-06-09 16:42

**Review time:** 16 Hours

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 Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty

<b>Creativity or innovation of this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation
<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<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
<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

The manuscript “Five-year outcomes of immediate implant placement for mandibular molars with chronic apical periodontitis: A retrospective study” was submitted to WJCC. The objective of this study was to compare retrospectively the 5-year clinical outcomes of immediate implant placement for the mandibular molars with and without chronic apical periodontitis. The authors concluded that both groups can achieve satisfactory 5-year clinical results. The study is interesting; however, some shortcomings are evident and therefore some recommendations are suggested. The authors do not indicate what the novelty of this study consists of. In particular, the study does not contain new concepts, hypotheses, and/or mechanistic, diagnostic, or therapeutic information. This should be reviewed and clarified in the manuscript. In general, the manuscript should be presented in a more coherent and organized manner. Specific comments are detailed below: Title: the title does not reflect the main

subject/hypothesis of the manuscript. The authors essentially compare two groups. This should be clear in the title. Abstract: The objective should state that two groups are being compared. The outcome variables studied should also be detailed. In the methods, it should be noted how, when and in what way these variables were evaluated. In the results, the findings obtained when comparing these variables in the groups should be presented, and finally, in the conclusions, the findings found in these variables when comparing the groups should be described. Line 6. The CAP group is described as an experimental group. This makes it appear that it is a clinical trial. It is recommended to treat it as a CAP group and the comparison group as a No CAP group. This should be corrected throughout the manuscript. Line 10. Define HU. Lines 9-11. At the end of the sentence, simply include the p-value in parentheses. Therefore, you avoid writing continuous sentence. Lines 12-13. Please present the values of marginal bone resorption and jump gap with p-values in parentheses. Moreover, please define gray values. It should be noted that the conclusions are based on the limitations of the study. Key Words: the keywords reflect the focus of the manuscript; however, most of them are not MeSH terms. Background: the manuscript adequately describes the background, and presents the status and significance of the study; however, some adjustments need to be made: Lines 10 13. Add references. Lines 17-20. Add references. Lines 29-30. Add more references. Lines 32-33. Add references. Line 34. Add references. Page 4. Line 4. Add references. Page 4. Line 7. Add references. Page 4. Line 8. Add the reference of Alsaadi et al. Page 4. Line 11. Add reference. Page 4. Lines 13-15. Different types of study are indicated but you only present a study carried out on animals. Page 4. Lines 15-16. The comment about your group is not necessary. Page 4. Lines 17-24. This paragraph is part of the methodology. It should be removed from the introduction. The authors must indicate the novelty of this study. The objective should be adjusted considering the recommendations given above. The study does not indicate anything about the

evaluation of patient satisfaction (line 26). How was it evaluated? Lines 27-28. This comment is unnecessary. Methods: Line 5. Some typos must be revised. Line 8. It must be indicated that the Declaration of Helsinki was fulfilled. Line 12. "no relevant". What do you mean? Line 21. Describe this disinfection routine in detail. Lines 25-26. This procedure should be described in more detail. Was a prosthetically guided protocol used? Please comment on this. Page 6. Line 2. "Cone-beam computed tomography". Present the acronym in parentheses. Was CBCT used before implant placement? Was it part of the protocol? Page 6. Line 12. The result of the intra and inter-examiner calibration must be presented. In the statistical analysis, the variables that had a normal distribution and those that did not should be presented. The primary and secondary outcome variables should be clearly defined. Figure 2. It is full of typos. "endoscopy"? Please revise. A preoperative radiograph is essential. The images should detail only the operating area. In figure E, the white space around the removed elements should be eliminated. Figure 3. Define MBD and gray. Results: Table 1 was not presented. It is essential that the comparison of all the baseline characteristics of the patients that made up the two groups be presented in a table. Define HU. Figure 4. p-values must be presented. "...and  $32.5 \pm 15.3$  5 years after implant restoration, with no significant differences between the two groups ( $p < 0.01$ )". It is indicated that there were no differences, but the p-value indicates that there were. Discussion. The information in the first paragraph has already been sufficiently presented. As in the introduction, many concepts are not supported by bibliographical references. "The present study involved no bone grafting in the jumping gap in the CAP or NC group". Contrast with other studies that do use it. *Porphyromonas* should be in italics. The discussion is very poor. The results should be contrasted with previous studies in a more detailed way. The many limitations of this study should be described. Conclusions: It should be noted that the conclusions are based on the limitations of the study.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 86053

**Title:** Comparison of five-year outcomes of immediate implant placement for mandibular molars with chronic apical periodontitis and those without obvious inflammation: a retrospective study

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06385159

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MDS

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-05-29

**Reviewer chosen by:** Geng-Long Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-06-12 19:49

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-06-12 19:57

**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
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty

<b>Creativity or innovation of this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation
<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<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
<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

The novelty of the study is questionable.

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 86053

**Title:** Comparison of five-year outcomes of immediate implant placement for mandibular molars with chronic apical periodontitis and those without obvious inflammation: a retrospective study

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 00742340

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** DDS, PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor, Doctor, Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-05-29

**Reviewer chosen by:** Cong Lin

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-06-27 01:04

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-06-27 01:41

**Review time:** 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



**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**

The authors corrected the manuscript properly; therefore, its publication is recommended