Manuscript: **"Evaluation of Piezotome-Corticision Assisted Orthodontics in Retracting Upper Canine: A Split Mouth Design (Randomized Clinical Trial)"**

Corresponding Author: Assistant Prof. Aly Osman

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Nayer Abo Saad, Professor of Periodontology, Director, Division of Oral Medicine, Oral Diagnosis & Radiology, Beirut Arab University, Lebanon

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Mihailescu RaduUniversity of Medicine, Pharmacy, Science and Tehnology (UMFST) Targu Mures, Romania

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021*

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ`s website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- ⦿ Yes
- ○ No

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- ⦿ Yes
- ○ No

You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- ⦿ Yes
- ○ No

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

*

(Please insert your comments)
The title is quiet clear and informative

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)
The abstract is well structured and presentable

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

(Please insert your comments)
Yes very few spelling mistakes that need minor revision

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)
The methods are quiet clear without any obscure techniques

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

*

(Please insert your comments)
the body of paper is quiet clear , simple and well structured

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*

(Please insert your comments)
the conclusion is based on the content findings and logically accurate.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.
(Please insert your comments)
the references are updated and adequate

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ○ 4
- ◉ 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ○ 4
- ◉ 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ◉ 4
- ○ 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ○ 4
- ◉ 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ○ 4
- ◉ 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ○ 4
- ◉ 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ◉ 4
- ○ 5

Overall Recommendation!!!
*

- ◉ Accepted, no revision needed
- ○ Accepted, minor revision needed
- ○ Return for major revision and resubmission
- ○ Reject

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021*

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:
*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ`s website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:
*

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:
*

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
*

(Please insert your comments)
The title is clear and consistent with the content of the paper

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
*

(Please insert your comments)
The abstract is well written and it's easy to understand how the study was conducted

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

(Please insert your comments)
There a are some grammatical errors, that I would like very much to be addressed to. In abstract in the sentence "The canine on the test side was closed by 6 weeks before the control side", should be reformulated "The canine on the test side was closed 6 weeks earlier than the control side." In introduction, first sentence it's "a drawback" instead of "a drawbacks". In introduction, 4th paragraph, last sentence, it should be "several researchers have", not has. In the statistical analysis the test is Kolmogorov not Kolmogrov. In results, throughout is a single word not two and in table 2 instead of signifinant it should be significant.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.
*

(Please insert your comments)
Very well presented, very detailed, the readers can easily understand how the treatment was conducted.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
*

(Please insert your comments)
The body is clear, no errors except the fact that I don't understand why the tables and figures are in a different document.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Conclusions are clear, short and accurate to the content presented.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

The list of References is comprehensive and appropiate.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ○ 4
- ◉ 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ○ 4
- ◉ 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ◉ 3
- ○ 4
- ○ 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ○ 4
- ◉ 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ● 4
- ○ 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ○ 4
- ● 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ○ 4
- ● 5

Overall Recommendation!!!
*

- ○ Accepted, no revision needed
- ● Accepted, minor revision needed
- ○ Return for major revision and resubmission
- ○ Reject

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
The revisions needed are mostly grammatical, also please introduce the tables and figures in the main document.