

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-53444

Date: 19-08-2025

Title: A Novel Approach in the treatment of Horizontal Root Fracture using K-File with MTA as an Intra-Radicular splint

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision.....✓.....

Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity		✓		
Significance		✓		

Reviewer Name: Shashi Prakash

Date: 19-08-2025

Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

(To be published with the manuscript in the journal)

The reviewer is requested to provide a brief comment (3-4 lines) highlighting the significance, strengths, or key insights of the manuscript. This comment will be Displayed in the journal publication alongside with the reviewers name.

This paper describes a new method for treating horizontal root fractures with an intra-radicular splint of a K-file and MTA, showing promising clinical and radiographic results at six months. The case is clearly documented and clinically significant, showing the biological benefits of MTA in fracture healing. Small errors in structure, grammar, figure legend, and consistency need to be corrected for better clarity.

Detailed Reviewer's Report

1. The abstract has briefly covered background, case presentation, treatment, and follow-up but has small gramatical flaws and irregular formatting (e.g., spacing, absence of articles). Recommend clarifying the purpose of the case report in the first sentence and highlighting the innovation of applying MTA with intraradicular splinting. Including an explicit concluding statement on clinical implications would enhance impact.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

2. The introduction sufficiently discusses epidemiology, factors of prognosis, and the reasons for the use of MTA, but it tends to repeat material from the abstract and intermingle general review statements with case-specific information. It could be improved with better organization: state the clinical issue briefly, provide a summary of limitations of current methods, and note the new contribution of this case. References must be kept consistent, and the sentence that refers to a mandibular lateral incisor is misplaced since the actual case involves a maxillary one.
3. The clinical information is detailed and sequential. Elaborate on some steps (e.g., timing between appointments, why 5 mm GP apically was left). Include a brief table outlining the treatment sequence would enhance clarity.
4. The discourse properly summarizes literature regarding healing patterns, rates of pulp necrosis, and the benefits of using MTA. Recommend breaking it up first to summarize the outcome of the case, compare it with previous methods, and finally state why this technique can be better.
5. The conclusion is explicitly stating the clinical importance of the technique, but it can be asserted more. Suggest highlighting the potential of this technique to drive future clinical practice or be studied in larger case series.
6. The article reports a novel method with good clinical applicability and illustrates a satisfactory short-term result. Minor changes can make it considerably better in terms of clarity and readability.