

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 61396

Title: Two-stage transcresal sinus floor elevation: Insight into 6 cases of replantation

Reviewer's code: 05476795

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Indonesia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-12-10

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-12-14 03:27

Reviewer performed review: 2020-12-16 03:36

Review time: 2 Days

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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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
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



**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>

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The results of this research strengthened findings of previous studies on the area of dental implantation. 1. Is there a step by step explanation as to how the two-stage TSFE protocol was executed? The abstract seem to provide a more detailed explanation on the methods of this study compared to the "methods" section. I suggest to reconstruct the abstract and methods section. 2. A few grammatical errors are still found in the manuscript. I suggest to reconstruct the abstract and methods section, and conduct a more thorough proofread of the manuscript. 3. Are there any other limitations to this study?