

Answering reviewers

March 29,2022

Dear editor,

Please find enclosed the edited manuscript in Word format(file name: 72476_Auto_Edited.docx)

Manuscript NO: 72476

Title: Combined Endodontic Therapy, Intentional Replantation and Radectomy Therapy for the Treatment of type III Radicular Groove with 2 roots: A case report.

Authors: Tan Dan, Li Shi-Ting, Feng Hao, Wang Zhong-Chao, Cai Wen and Minhai Nie

Journal title: World Journal of Clinical Cases

The manuscript has improved according to the suggestions of reviewers:

1 Format has been updated.

2 Revision has been made according to the suggestions of the reviewer

The first review's composition comment on the manuscript and my answer

- (1) Title – he/she recommend changing the title (it doesn't need to be too long or reveal all the procedures performed to solve the clinical case).

Answer: Yes, I agree with your comment and have changed the title.

- (2) Case summary - line 2: change we describe by we described. - line 7: change was used by were used. - line 8: the term significant could be interpreted with a statistical connotation, so i recommend only mentioning periodontal/periradicular healing. - line 9: don't abbreviate the words (months, weeks and days).

Answer: Yes, I agree with your comment and make the corresponding modifications.

- (3) Key words - variety of words not found in the decs/mesh.

Answer: Yes, I agree with your comment and make the corresponding modifications to make sure the keywords fit the requirements.

- (4) Introduction - line 28: for relative data i recommend using whole numbers without decimal. - pag. 2 line 14: change we describe by we described.

Answer: Yes, I agree with your comment and make the corresponding modifications.

- (5) Reorganize the last paragraph (you could mention what was observed in the clinical case but it is not necessary to mention the results and the conclusion).

Answer: Yes, I agree with your comment and reorganize the last paragraph.

- (6) Pag. 3 line 8: be careful with the use of the word significant. Don't abbreviate months.

Answer: Yes, I agree with your comment and make the corresponding modifications.

- (7) Case presentation chief complaint line 27: give more details of the patient's complaint at the time of seeking care (did the patient complain of pain, bleeding gums, suppuration, eating disorders or other?)

Answer: Yes, I agree with your comment and make the corresponding modifications. I add more details of the patient's complaint

- (8) History of present illness line 29: don't abbreviate the word day.

Answer: Yes, I agree with your comment and make the corresponding modifications.

- (9) History of past illness - pag.4 line 1: mention if the patient has undergone previous procedures. Physical examination - line 4: i recommend mentioning that thermal and electrical tests were performed to verify the pulp sensitivity since it is most likely that the pulp had necrosed. - line 6: replace depth of periodontal probing by clinical probing depth.

- furthermore considering that the manuscript will be read by a heterogeneous audience (graduate and undergraduate) mention in detail the instruments used for the physical examination.

Answer: Yes, I agree with your comment and make the corresponding modifications.

- (10) Laboratory test -line 9: mention the blood parameters evaluated as well as the reference values used. Imaging examinations - line 11: write in full cbct, because otherwise it could be difficult for non-specialist readers to read. - give more details of the imaging features. - the quality of the tomographic images could be improved (c-d pag. 12).

Answer: Yes, I agree with your comment and make the corresponding modifications. We refined the lab tests and gave more details.

- (11) Final diagnosis - mention in detail the radiographic and clinical features consistent with the definitive diagnosis.

Answer: Yes, I agree with your comment and make the corresponding modifications. I mention more the radiographic and clinical features in detail to make an accurate diagnosis

- (12) Treatment - line 22: replace hopeless by tooth with questionable prognosis. - line 28: mention the brands of the equipment used according to the standard. - give more details about the treatment (type of instrumentation, working compliance and all factors that could help in the performance of the whole treatment by other professionals).

Answer: Yes, I agree with your comment and make the corresponding modifications. I mention the brands of the equipment used according to the standard and give more details about the treatment.

- (13) Pag. 5 line 5: the following questions arise: what is the probability that after twelve weeks the fistula tract will have closed? Justify with the literature.

Answer: We determine the timing of the operation based on references.

- (14) Line 5: replace deep palatal pocket by clinical probing depth. - line 9: mention brand, concentration, and amount of the anesthesia used.

Answer: Yes, I agree with your comment and make the corresponding modifications.

- (15) Line 21: more details about the type of material used for splinting and what the occlusal condition was at the time. - why was rigid splinting not used?

Answer: After surgery, we reminded the patient to avoid biting hard objects; I think rigid splinting was ok too.

- (16) Line 22: more details about the antibiotic therapy. Explain why the antibiotic was given after the procedure and why no analgesic/antiinflammatory medication was given in addition to the duration of each rinse with chlorhexidin.

Answer: Yes, I agree with your comment and give more details about the antibiotic therapy. I think it is enough to use antibiotics after surgery, and there is no need to use analgesic/anti-inflammatory medication. If patients feel obvious pain, they can buy them by themselves.

- (17) Outcome and follow-up - line 28: avoid the use of vague terms (excellent). - line 30: avoid the abbreviation (months, weeks). - pag. 6 line 1: replace the depth of periodontal probe by clinical probing depth.

Answer: Yes, I agree with your comment and make the corresponding modifications.

(18) Is one month sufficient to radiographically observe changes in the periapical/periradicular tissues?

Answer: According to the references, the patient was informed of review at 1, 3, 6 and 12 months after the procedure, at the same time underwent radiographically observation.

(19) What was the patient's adherence and tolerance to the treatment? - if there were adverse events, mention them!

Answer: In this case, the patient was very cooperative with treatment and follow-up.

(20) Discussion - reorganize the paragraphs, as they are too long. - in the first paragraph you have to mention the primary results and compare them with the existing literature. - then mention what the clinical case brings to the field and what the clinical relevance is. Mention what has been done by other authors. Emphasize the importance of radectomy in teeth with two independent roots. Focus the discussion on your clinical case.

Answer: Yes, I agree with your comment and make the corresponding modifications.

(21) Justify why guided tissue regeneration was not used in conjunction with reimplantation. What are the technical, clinical limitations and adverse events during the resolution of the clinical case?

Answer: Since we did not scratch the alveolar fossa in order to remain the periodontal ligament intact, the infection of the root tip was serious, which was not suitable for GBR. Moreover, GBR would increase the difficulty of replanting the teeth to the appropriate position, which might cause occlusion trauma. We considered that if the effect of this operation was not ideal, later GBR might be needed, but did not choose to perform simultaneous surgery. During the follow-up, the outcome of the procedure was favorable. There was an acceptable healing process. The patient's initial complaints had resolved. Significant healing could be detected in the clinical examination (the sinus tract and the depth of clinical probing depth). The follow-up radiographs showed bone deposition in the affected area, as evidenced by the reduced area of radiolucency. Based on this, it was decided that intentional replantation and radectomy would be sufficient, and no further surgical (GBR) would be needed.

(22) Conclusion - reorganize it since it should meet the objective of the clinical case presentation.

Answer: Yes, I agree with your comment and make the corresponding modifications.

(23) References - review references, there are some repeated (12/25, 13/17)

Answer: Yes, I agree with your comment and make the corresponding modifications.

The second review's composition comment on the manuscript and my answer

Please improve the English grammar, style, and fluency. Possibly, hand the paper to a professional English editor. I see you have complied to the care checklist, which is good. But please elaborate even more on every detail of the diagnosis, treatment, outcomes, and follow-ups. So please elaborate more. In the conclusions, please limit this section to the results and avoid deductions or subjective opinions. More pictures would favor the report.

Answer: Yes, I agree with your comment and make the corresponding modifications. I elaborate more on every detail of the diagnosis, treatment, outcomes, and follow-ups and improve the English grammar, style, and fluency.

The third review's composition comment on the manuscript and my answer

It only needs two small corrections that i have noted in the attached file.

Answer: I have carefully read the attached file you sent me , I agree with your comment and make the corresponding modifications.

The fourth review's composition comment on the manuscript and my answer

- (1) Abstract conclusion line 11- "intentional replantation and radectomy offer a predictable procedure and should be..." Authors, you cannot conclude that your treatment is a predictable procedure since it is only based on the results of one case.

Answer: Yes, I agree with your comment and make the corresponding modifications.

- (2) Introduction – line 21. core tip line 23 – "minimally invasive procedure." This reviewer does not consider your treatment minimally invasive. Please change text.

Answer: Yes, I agree with your comment and change text.

- (3) Case presentation line 1: change the text "free previous medical history". For instance: the patient has a negative medical history and denied.....trauma.

Answer: Yes, I agree with your comment and make the corresponding modifications.

- (4) Treatment line 22- replace "required" with "elected" line 26- replace segregated with "isolated with rubberdam"

Answer: Yes, I agree with your comment and make the corresponding modifications.

- (5) Discussion line 13- propertiesy spelling!!

Answer: Thank you for reminding me. I have respelled the word.

- (6) Conclusions line 1- this reviewer is not sure that animal studies are indicated or feasible. Clinical studies on the other ha d are indicated and mat eventually lead to using the "predictable" treatment.

Answer: Yes, I agree with your comment and make the corresponding modifications.

The fourth review's composition comment on the manuscript and my answer

- (1) The last paragraph of the introduction should be moved to case presentation and discussion section

Answer: Yes, I agree with your comment and make the corresponding modifications.

- (2) Regarding the each statements of the sentences (in this report, we describe a 16-year-old boy with a maxillary lateral incisor with type iii radicular groove (deep radicular groove extending to the root apex and with two independent root canals). In this case, a combination of endodontic therapy, intentional replantation, and radectomy was used, resulting in periodontal healing and significant healing of the periradicular radiolucency after 12 mo. At 1-year follow-up, the patient was comfortable and complete resolution of the periapical pathology was evident. In conclusion, intentional replantation combined endodontic and radectomy provides a predictable procedure and should be recognized as a viable treatment modality for the management of type iii radicular grooves with two independent root canals.) For instance, the authors should not give the conclusion statements in introduction section.

Answer: Yes, I agree with your comment and make the corresponding modifications.

3 References and typesetting were corrected

Thank you again for publishing our manuscript in the *World Journal of Clinical Cases*.

Yours sincerely

Dan Tan

The Affiliated Stomatological Hospital of Southwest Medical University,
Luzhou Key Laboratory of Oral & Maxillofacial Reconstruction and Regeneration ,
2# Jiangyang South Road, Jiangyang District, Luzhou 646000, China.
E-mail :594829202@qq.com