



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Research and Reports in Dentistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJRRD_43021
Title of the Manuscript:	NON SURGICAL MANAGEMENT OF LARGE CYST LIKE LESION USING TRIPLE ANTIBIOTIC PASTE
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>)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	As per apical size by Kim et al is the preparation done for CI and LI adequate? Is inadequate BMP one of the causes of persistent purulent discharge? Is TAP associated with causing further discoloration of teeth? Would it be a wise choice for already discolored anteriors? If pt was asymptomatic why was TAP placed for further one month? Is the long term use of tetracycline ICM capable of causing any side effects?	Apical size preparation was adequate. Huge chronic lesion was the cause of persistent purulent discharge As calcium hydroxide failed to heal the lesion TAP was the only choice apart from surgical endodontics
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Retention wire= fixed retainer? Is root zx accurate in the presence of purulent discharge? Why was the radioagraph done later? References- vancouver style	Retention wire was fixed retainer for orthodontic purpose Radiograph was taken to eliminate any error if possible due to apex locator. References are in Vancouver style
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Are these gramatically correct? Are usually a sequel to ...	Sir I think it is correct