



SDI Review Form 1.6

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

Reviewer Details:

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