

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_82637
Title of the Manuscript:	Revascularization Using Lesion Sterilization and Tissue Repair: A Case Report.
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:

(<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>)

### **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	<p>The article contains very useful and interesting information, but it also has some major flaws that require revision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-the title of the paper should be more suggestive – it should contain suggestive elements for the contained topic;</li><li>-question arise concerning the patient informed consent and agreement of the Ethics Commission – please specify the number;</li><li>-the abbreviations should be explained the first time they appear in the text (MTA, LSTR);</li><li>- word editing and English language need correction;</li><li>- numbering of bibliographic references in the text - 4 appears before 3, and reference 10 is not found in the text;</li><li>- the methodology part requires a more detailed presentation of each stage, until the end: how was the revascularization of the pulp ensured? Was the paste reapplied during the check-ups?</li><li>- the Introduction part, as well as the Discussion part, should refer to existing studies in the literature on this topic, especially as reviews are available;</li><li>- the last sentence, before the Conclusions chapter, is unfinished;</li><li>- half of the bibliographic references are older than 2010, and some of them were accessed in 2008/2009. I recommend consulting some references from the last 5 years and more recently accessing the specialized sites.</li></ul>	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments		
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		

Review Form 1.6

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bobu Livia-Ionela
Department, University & Country	“Grigore T. Popa” University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Romania