



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJMMR_17710
Title of the Manuscript:	"Replantation of knocked out tooth after traumatic avulsions."
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>)



SDI 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	For what reason have been made panoramic radiographs to assess the affected area (Figure 4.2), if the periapical radiographs (which in addition to promoting better visualization and generate a lower radiation dose) had already been made? I suggest the removal of panoramic radiographs.	We advised the initial panoramic radiograph to examine the surrounding boney areas, and to check the presence of any other pathology after replantation regarding resorption or ankylosis. Upon reviewer comments we removed the panoramic radiograph, however we still think that panoramic radiograph will emphasize the clinical evidence.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	In the: Line 163 - correct the word compared (caompared) Line 91 - change (did not able) for was not able Line 92 - remove the ; signal and replace by comma Line 110 - correct the word ankylosis (alkalosis) Line 212 remove the number 1 in the number 188 Line 217 remove the numbers 1 and 3 in the number 1351 Line 191 remove o number 3 in the number 384 Line 194 remove o number 4 in the number 488	All the corrections suggest by honorable reviewer is justified. Those are corrected and marked with yellow highlight. The new line that refer to the correction is as below: Line 164 – previous 163 Line 91- previous 87 Line 92- previous 88 Line 110- previous 110 Line 212- previous 213 Line 217- previous 218 Line 191- previous 192 Line 194- previous 195
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	A very instructive article, which certainly will help clinicians to conduct such cases	Thank you honourable reviewer for your valuable comments.