

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Research and Reports in Dentistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJRRD_84511
Title of the Manuscript:	SOONER THE BETTER: EARLY INTERCEPTION USING 2X4 APPLIANCE IN MIXED DENTITION PERIOD-A CASE REPORT
Type of the Article	Case report

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:

(<https://www.journalijrrd.com/index.php/IJRRD/editorial-policy>)

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>The author's work is appreciated but it would have been better if they incorporate these suggestions to make this manuscript even better.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Please cite the reference while mentioning the prevalence of supernumerary teeth in the introduction part.2. Is the term "odontome" comes with the supernumerary teeth or is it the one of the tumors of oral cavity? Odontome is of two types- complex and compound. Compound odontome may resemble to supernumerary teeth. Which type you are mentioning is not clear. Please check it, be clear and mention it nicely.3. It's better to mention the inventor of 2x4 appliance in the introduction part.4. It would be better if lateral cephalogram and it's finding are included in the manuscript.5. In case presentation section, you mention that it is diagnosed by intraoral examination as complex odontome, how without having an x-ray?6. For mixed dentition space analysis, which analysis was used, it is not clearlt mentioned.7. Treatment options/alternative and treatment objective are not mentioned well, please address these.8. Is it ok to close space in 0.018" Niti by using power e-chain?9. What about the space distal to the lateral incisor, while keeping the fixed retainer from lateral to lateral?10. In discussion part, early versus late treatment protocol and it' pros and cons by various authors were not mentioned, it need to be cited.11. Abbreviation for 'AAO' is not complet	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Corrected and highlighted2. Compound odontome (Mentioned and highlighted)3.4.5. Maxillary occlusal and IOPAR already cited and highlighted6. Moyer's mixed dentition space analysis (Mentioned and highlighted)7. Mentioned and highlighted8. Arch wire number mentioned was incorrect. It was 0.016 NiTi arch wire. (Correction made and highlighted) . e-chain generally used with 0.014/0.016 NiTi wire9. For eruption of 23 (canine). Pt was not ready for any skeletal maturation till canine eruption10. Mentioned and highlighted11. Completed abbreviation mentioned and highlighted
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The sentences in the abstract and in the introduction part is similar, it's better to modify it in any one place.2. It is not necessary to mention 'Tung et al, 1998' in second paragraph as reference is already cited in the text.	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Abstract modified and highlighted2. References [1] cited
Optional/General comments	Please go through the whole article and write it in a good flow to make this manuscript better.	

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 authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p> No	