



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMMR_23758
Title of the Manuscript:	TO COMPARE THE PURSUANCE OF ULTRASONIC ACTIVATION AT DISTINCT PLANES OF ENODONTIC THERAPY ON FILLING SUPERIORITY OF DIFFERENT ROOT CANAL SEALERS.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

**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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<b>Abstract – conclusion</b> rewrite many grammatical errors <b>Keywords?</b> Do you really need to put points in numbers ? eg. Pg 2 line 38 <b>Introduction</b> is too long and meandering needs to be significantly shortened Pls chk the text of statistical analysis -makes very little sense <b>Discussion</b> -It needs to be made more crisp and to the point	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	What is the difference between the two objectives? What about age of patients in whom these extractions were carried out? Wouldn't that affect the size of canal?	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	References need to be standardise	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Neha sisodia</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Dental Department, Postgraduate Institute of Medical Education and Research and Ram Manohar Lohia Hospital, New Delhi, India</b>