

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Stomatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 15226

Title: The effects of different root canal preparation methods on root fracture resistance: a systematic review of the literature

Reviewer's code: 00569585

Reviewer's country: Switzerland

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2014-11-16 22:22

Date reviewed: 2014-12-29 22:30

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Paper is acceptable. Language needs to be revised.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Stomatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 15226

Title: The effects of different root canal preparation methods on root fracture resistance: a systematic review of the literature

Reviewer's code: 00566515

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2014-11-16 22:22

Date reviewed: 2015-01-02 18:32

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This paper is potentially valuable, but its language is very poor and makes its reading very difficult. I have stopped reading (and correcting) the manuscript before its end, since it needs a great amount of language editing before the final reviewing. Authors are encouraged to take all measures to ensure the final version is accurate and precise. For instance: references must be checked.