



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_50952
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of agreement between non-surgical management techniques for large periapical lesions
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>In Abstract:</p> <p>In Conclusion: Need to be described .. Treatments with Calcium hydroxide and Bio-dentine is higher ...?? compared to others.</p> <p>In result: Model A was selected as the best homoscedastic model (Table 2). ...Describe the reason .. Model J was selected as the best model..... Describe the reason</p> <p>In Discussion: They have selected the patients exhibiting well circumscribed periapical lesions of more than 5mm in diameter did not mention in the material and method part</p> <p>Therefore, mixed effects model analysis' was applied in this study- ..Not clear, need to be explained why this 'mixed effects model analysis' was applied in this study instead of for further treatment based on the result of this study</p> <p>In conclusion: Moreover, the agreement between the treatments using Calcium hydroxide and Bio-dentine is higher compared to other treatments ??? -- not clear or wrong statement</p> <p>References: Some references need to be exchanged with the update ones, such as no. 2,6,9,10 etc...</p>	All corrections done
Minor REVISION comments	<p>In Result: Figure 2 implies that Treatment 1 was mostly given to the patients above 30 years, while the other two treatments (Treatment 1 and Treatment 2) ?? → treatment 2 and 3??</p>	
Optional/General comments	Can be accepted with the revision above ..	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	