



### REVIEWER'S REPORT

**Manuscript No.: IJAR-56879**

**Title: Rehabilitation of Maxillary Anterior Tooth Spacing Using Digital Smile Designing with IPSe.max Laminate Veneers: A Case Report**

**Recommendation:**

- Accept as it is .....
- Accept after minor revision.....Yes.....**
- Accept after major revision .....
- Do not accept (*Reasons below*) .....

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

**Reviewer Name: Dr. Sireesha Kuruganti**

### Detailed Reviewer's Report

**Abstract (Lines 12–31)**

- Strengths:
  - o Clear articulation of IPS e.max properties (lines 14–17).
  - o Emphasis on minimally invasive approach and patient specific planning (lines 21–25).
- Weaknesses:
  - o Slightly verbose; could be condensed for clarity.
  - o Patient satisfaction (line 27) is mentioned but lacks quantifiable evidence.
- Suggestion: Add a measurable outcome (e.g., VAS score for esthetics).

**Introduction (Lines 34–end of section)**

- Strengths:
  - o Comprehensive coverage of etiology of anterior spacing (lines 34–40).
  - o Integration of DSD into diagnostic workflow (lines 47–53).
- Weaknesses:
  - o References are cited (e.g., 14,15) but not contextualized in the text.
  - o Some sentences are long and difficult to parse (lines 41–46).
- Suggestion: Shorten sentences and explicitly link references to claims.

**Case Report (Lines ~70–150)**

- Strengths:
  - o Detailed clinical description (lines 72–90).
  - o Clear documentation of treatment options and patient choice (lines 100–105).
  - o Digital Smile Designing workflow explained (lines 110–120).
  - o Preparation design rationale (lines 130–140).
- Weaknesses:
  - o Figures are referenced (e.g., Figure 6, line 118) but captions are minimal.
  - o Shade selection (line 140) is mentioned but lacks justification.
- Suggestion: Provide more detail on why shade was accepted without modification.

# International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

*www.journalijar.com*

---

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

### Discussion (Lines ~200–280)

- Strengths:
  - o Good review of etiological factors (lines 210–220).
  - o Strong justification for DSD use (lines 230–240).
  - o Literature support for preparation design (lines 260–280).
- Weaknesses:
  - o Some repetition of points already covered in Introduction.
  - o References (e.g., Meijering et al., Smales et al., lines 270–280) are cited but not critically analyzed.
- Suggestion: Add comparative analysis of survival rates with statistical context.

### Conclusion (Lines ~300–320)

- Strengths:
  - o Summarizes the role of DSD and IPS e.max veneers effectively (lines 305–315).
  - o Highlights predictability and personalization (line 315).
- Weaknesses:
  - o Lacks mention of limitations (e.g., cost, technique sensitivity).
- Suggestion: Add a balanced note on limitations and scope for future research.

### References (Lines ~330 onwards)

- Strengths:
  - o Includes seminal works (Calamia, Magne & Belser, Peumans, etc.).
- Weaknesses:
  - o Formatting inconsistent (e.g., line spacing, punctuation).
  - o Some references (e.g., Gürel, listed twice at 9 and 16) are duplicated.
- Suggestion: Standardize reference style (APA/Vancouver) and remove duplicates.

### Overall Evaluation

- Strengths: Well structured case report, strong integration of DSD, evidence based veneer design.
- Weaknesses: Verbosity, limited quantifiable outcomes, minor reference inconsistencies.
- Recommendation: Accept with minor revisions—mainly tightening language, clarifying figures, and strengthening evidence presentation.