



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Dental Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJDS_45136
Title of the Manuscript:	ESTHETIC CONSIDERATIONS WHEN RESTORING SINGLE MAXILLARY CENTRAL INCISOR.
Type of the Article	Case study

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>There are too many mistakes in text. I am of the opinion that publishing by this is not appropriate. After major changes are made, if the editors see fit, the article can be re-evaluated. I have specified some notes below and in text:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The text not written according to the rules of the journal for the case reports. (Abstract, Introduction, Presentation of Case, Discussion, Conclusion, Acknowledgement) 2. Sections (main headings; introduction, material and methods,..) are not numbered. 3. The ethics committee approval certificate received? And patient approval certificate received? 4. The cites of references not written according to the rules of the journal in the text. They need to be enclosed in square brackets [...], not (...), and will be used after punctuation. 5. The brand and origin of the used equipment and devices are not specified. 6. Spelling, grammar and punctuation marks too much in the text. 7. The brackets (fig..) should be use for figures, not square brackets. 8. The reference list is not written according to the rules of the journal. 9. There are too many figures and reference numbers, journal rules have been excluded (Max. 20 reference, 5 figure). 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that



SDI Review Form 1.6

		authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u>	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u> <u>Yes, The ethics committee approval certificate received? And patient approval certificate received?</u>	
<u>If plagiarism is suspected, please provide related proofs or web links.</u>	No, I have attached the pdf of originality report by Ithenticate (% 20 similarity index).	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Alper Özdoğan</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Atatürk University, Turkey.</i>