

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 58087

**Title:** Conservative endodontic management using a calcium silicate bioceramic sealer for delayed root fracture: A case report and review of literature

**Reviewer's code:** 05046014

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-11-11

**Reviewer chosen by:** Chen-Chen Gao

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-11-24 19:01

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-11-28 11:57

**Review time:** 3 Days and 16 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
<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 type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" 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**

major revisions • “Tooth # 9 did not respond to electric pulp test” What was the reason why a cold vitality test was not performed? • Why do you number (mark) the teeth with # and a number afterwards? • The "tooth # 8" 1.1 dental element reported that it was asymptomatic. was the tooth vital? Was the tooth necrosis? How did it respond to the electrical test? if it resulted in necrosis because the endodontic treatment was not taken into consideration given the optimal result obtained with the “tooth # 9” 1.2. ? did you consider it appropriate not to intervene given the absence of clinical symptoms? • "Cvek et al. [5] has reported that all the 7 cases which were prepared and filled both fragments failed to heal. The material for obturation in their report is chloropercha and 5% resin-chloroform, which may influence the effect of the treatment "THE FAILURES REPORTED BY Cvek on what factors may depend? can it depend on the type of filling performed? • What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? • "BRUNO et al. [25] “The reference does not need to be capitalized • ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS? Are present ?

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 58087

**Title:** Conservative endodontic management using a calcium silicate bioceramic sealer for delayed root fracture: A case report and review of literature

**Reviewer's code:** 05046014

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-11-11

**Reviewer chosen by:** Pan Huang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-12-15 12:47

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-12-15 13:40

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<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>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

the authors have adequately answered all the questions posed, and made the required changes. I consider the manuscript worthy of publication