Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Dental Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJDS_87720
Title of the Manuscript:	Whale's tail technique – A novel approach for regeneration in aesthetic zone
Type of the Article	Case report

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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.journalajds.com/index.php/AJDS/editorial-policy)

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	This is a case report of a 49 years-old male patient with pain and increasing space between his upper front tooth region. The patient was treated with a novel modified Whale's tail technique in achieving primary closure of the flap followed by regeneration of the defect in a complex esthetic zone due to a high frenum. The manuscript contains three keywords, three figures, and five references. Overall, it is a correct case report, although some remarks are made in different sections of the manuscript.	The reconstructory
	Keywords The manuscript presents three keywords. According to the journal's guidelines, about 4-8 keywords should be given. Please, consider, at least, adding one more keyword. For keywords, where possible, please use Medical Subject Headings terms (MeSH Terms). None of them is a MeSH term. These suggestions about keywords are optional, not mandatory.	
	Introduction To make text understanding easier, if the author's name appears in the text, place the reference number immediately after the name, not at the end of the sentence or paragraph. In the text, two authors (Michaelides & Wilson) who do not appear in the reference list are cited. Please include the reference (article) to these authors in your list and the corresponding reference number in the text. References must be listed at the end of the manuscript and numbered in the order that they appear in the text. So, in the text, the reference numbers must be reordered. Abbreviations and acronyms should be explained the first time they are used, e.g. COE-PAK	
	Discussion Again, in the text, two authors (Cortellini & Tonetti) who do not appear in the reference list are cited. Please include the reference (article) to these authors in your list and the corresponding reference number in the text. Please, replace "(Mrunal et al. 2016)" with its corresponding reference number in square brackets.	
	References Total number of manuscript references: 5. This section requires a comprehensive revision. References should be checked carefully to transcribe them accurately. At least, two new references (articles) must be added. The reference format does not match the journal's instructions about references. Please, follow the following format for journal's references: 1. Hilly M, Adams ML, Nelson SC. A study of digit fusion in the mouse embryo. Clin Exp Allergy. 2002;32(4):489-98. Note: List the first six authors followed by et al. Note: Use of DOI number for the full-text article is encouraged. (if available). Note: Authors are also encouraged to add other database's unique identifier (like PUBMED ID).	
	Figures Total number of manuscript figures: 3. In figure legends, unexplained abbreviations are used, e.g. "preop", "post op", "GTR". Please, correct this.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

		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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alberto Rodriguez-Archilla	
Department, University & Country	University of Granada, Spain	

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)