

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Research and Reports in Dentistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJRRD_130118
Title of the Manuscript:	Interdental papillary reconstruction with non-surgical and surgical techniques: A case report
Type of the Article	Case report

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Of course the manuscript is valuable to the scientific community. It has expanded the scope of knowledge on the interdental papillary reconstruction It has also paves a way for more in depth future research on the subject matter.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is apt. however, it is not in tandem with the objective highlighted by the authors.	The title has been changed to - Rebuilding the Pink Esthetics: Credible Approaches in Interdental Papillary Reconstruction
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is comprehensive. But, the authors should amend the objective where they stated "To compare and evaluate black triangle fill using nonsurgical and surgical techniques for interdental papilla reconstruction"	The aim has been changed to- To evaluate black triangle fill using nonsurgical and surgical techniques for interdental papilla reconstruction.
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	It is correct as a case report where the authors will just document what they observed in the different treatment approaches. However, the sample of 2 or 3 procedures is too small for them to make some categorical statements about comparison between different procedures. If they want to do that, they should change the title of the study, its methodology and expand the sample size appropriately.	No direct conclusion was made but only stated that from the case report outcome, non-surgical approach (i-PRF) was better than surgical approach.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are adequate and relatively recent. However, the authors did not adhere to one referencing style which I have highlighted for them in the reviewed document. Also, some references are incomplete	Corrections have been made and reference pattern has been revised to Vancouver style. References that were suggested by the editors have also been included in the manuscript.
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It is suitable. Just few comments which can be found in the reviewed document.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT	Corrections have been made accordingly.

Review Form 3

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)	No ethical issues.