

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 80981

Title: Efficacy of invisible advancement correction for mandibular retraction in adolescents based on Pancherz analysis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05234412

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MDS

Professional title: Reader (Associate Professor)

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-10-21

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-11-28 04:21

Reviewer performed review: 2022-11-28 04:23

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	 [] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	 [] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[]Yes [Y]No



Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

the language could be refined better



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 80981

Title: Efficacy of invisible advancement correction for mandibular retraction in adolescents based on Pancherz analysis

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: 2022-10-21

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-11-28 08:29

Reviewer performed review: 2022-11-28 15:20

Review time: 6 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	 [] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[]Yes [Y]No



Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. The study is a valuable case series, but I see the CONSORT items are not fully applied. Some items are not properly done into the paper. Please recheck the CONSORT and apply all the items entirely. 2. Please add to the limitations the lack of randomization and the retrospective nature of the study. 3. Also please explain the lack of any control groups. 4. Please explain the sample size calculation method and parameters. Why 30 patients and not 35 or 40 for example? Explain in detail. 5. All of such items like above are already in the CONSORT checklist. Currently, the CONSORT items are not really applied properly. Please read it again and carefully apply its items. 6. Since this is a case series, you should also apply the CARE checklist for case reports. Please apply all CARE items and attach the filled out CARE checklist with the revision. 7. The English grammar needs heavy revisions. 8. Figures 3 and 4 had low quality. They need to be upgraded to publication quality. Currently, it is visible that they are screenshots from Word text boxes. 9. Figures 3 and 4 are also difficult to understand. Please explain them fully in their legends.