Brazilian Dental Science

Subject: [BDS] Editor Decision

Dear Jefferson Pires da Silva Júnior, Cláudio Moreira Júnior, Renata Cristófori Vilas Bôas, Victoria Garcia Carvalho, Amanda Rossato, Pedro Henrique Condé Oliveira Prado, Sérgio Eduardo de Paiva Gonçalves:

Your submission Prosthodontic reintervention in a young patient with esthetic disharmony and periodontal injury: a clinical report 36-month follow-up to Brazilian Dental Science, has been revised and according to reviewers' comments, there are questions to be addressed and/or points to be clarified/corrected. Please answer the reviewers considerations point-by-point in a separate document and also please make all the corrections in the text highlighted in yellow.

Deadline: 30 days

Thank you for considering Brazilian Dental Science for publishing your research. We are looking forward the revised version of you manuscript.

Sincerely,

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Resubmit for Review

Questionnaire

Does the manuscript contain new and significant information to justify publication?*

No

Brazilian Dental Science

Does the Abstract (Summary) clearly and accurately describe the content of the article?

Yes

Is the problem significant and concisely stated?

No

Are the methods or research design described comprehensively? Is the statistical analysis adequate?

Not Applicable

Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the results?

No

Is adequate reference made to other work in the field?

Yes

Is the language acceptable?

Yes

Manuscript Structure

Length of article is:*

Adequate

Number of tables is:

Adequate

Brazilian Dental Science

Number of figures is:

Too Short

Please state any conflict(s) of interest that you have in relation to the review of this paper (state "none" if this is not applicable).

None

Rating

Interest*

Average

Quality

Good

Originality

Average

Overall

Good

Recommendation

Major Revision

Would you be willing to review a revision of this manuscript?

Yes

Comments

Comments to the Author

Brazilian Dental Science

The paper is generally well written, however, I would like to suggest some points that could strengthen the discussion:

-The objective appears to overstate the level of evidence provided by a single case report. A case report cannot establish diagnostic criteria or identify factors influencing prosthetic reintervention decisions in a generalizable manner. The authors may consider rephrasing the objective to better reflect the descriptive nature of the study.

*Introduction

-The authors mention the existence of both invasive and non-invasive procedures; however, they do not clearly define which treatment approaches are considered invasive and which are considered non-invasive.

- Including a discussion of periodontal parameters, tissue response, probing depths, gingival architecture, or radiographic findings would strengthen the connection between the literature and the reported outcome.

-The introduction does not discuss operator-related factors or technical errors that may contribute to periodontal complications following rehabilitation procedures. Since these factors can significantly influence clinical outcomes, their inclusion would enrich the background section and provide a more comprehensive context for the case.

*Case Report
Some important clinical information appears to be missing from the case description:

-No radiographic images were presented. Radiographs are essential for the evaluation and documentation of periodontal and restorative conditions and would greatly enhance the scientific value of the report.
-The periodontal probing measurements were not reported. Including baseline and follow-up probing depths would provide objective evidence of the periodontal condition and treatment outcomes.

*Discussion

Brazilian Dental Science

-A substantial part of the discussion focuses on general concepts regarding crown replacement, adhesion procedures, silanization, airborne-particle abrasion, and rubber dam isolation. While these topics are relevant, the discussion would benefit from a stronger focus on the specific clinical findings and outcomes of the presented case. In case reports, the discussion should primarily interpret the clinical observations and explain how the treatment approach influenced the final outcome.

-The authors emphasize the importance of periodontal health and emergence profile; however, neither the introduction nor the discussion does not adequately relate these concepts to objective clinical findings from the case.

-The statement regarding restoration of the emergence profile and papilla filling is supported by literature, but the manuscript does not provide objective measurements or standardized clinical assessments demonstrating these improvements in the present case.

-The comparison between the initial and final photographs focuses mainly on aesthetic outcomes. However, a more comprehensive discussion of functional outcomes, periodontal stability, and maintenance during follow-up would provide stronger clinical evidence of treatment success.

-The section discussing rubber dam isolation appears extensive considering its limited relevance to the primary objective of the report.

-Finally, the limitations of the report should be acknowledged. The absence of quantitative periodontal data and the limited follow-up information reduce the ability to evaluate long-term periodontal stability and treatment predictability.

-The authors state that the final result follows the principles of the golden ratio; however, no objective measurements or analyses are provided to support this statement. The authors should either provide quantitative evidence or consider rephrasing this conclusion.

Brazilian Dental Science

Reviewer B:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

Questionnaire

Does the manuscript contain new and significant information to justify publication?*

Yes

Does the Abstract (Summary) clearly and accurately describe the content of the article?

Yes

Is the problem significant and concisely stated?

Yes

Are the methods or research design described comprehensively? Is the statistical analysis adequate?

Yes

Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the results?

Not Applicable

Is adequate reference made to other work in the field?

Yes

Is the language acceptable?

Brazilian Dental Science

Not Applicable

Manuscript Structure

Length of article is:*

Adequate

Number of tables is:

Too Short

Number of figures is:

Adequate

Please state any conflict(s) of interest that you have in relation to the review of this paper (state "none" if this is not applicable).

None

Rating

Interest*

Good

Quality

Good

Originality

Good

Overall

Good

Brazilian Dental Science

Recommendation

Minor Revision

Would you be willing to review a revision of this manuscript?

Yes

Comments

Comments to the Author

Dear author,
Due to significant revisions, the manuscript must be resubmitted. You must review all of the important comments in the attached file, thoroughly edit each point that requires revision, and make any necessary changes.
Warm regards,

Brazilian Dental Science