

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-58267

Title: Comparative Evaluation of DFDBA and PRF Plug in Socket Preservation: A Case Report.,

Recommendation:

Accept after minor revision

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality	yes			
Techn. Quality		good		
Clarity		good		
Significance	yes			

Reviewer's ID: JPR- 237

Detailed Reviewer's Report

The presented manuscript an interesting clinical case comparing DFDBA and PRF for socket preservation. However, the methodology, radiographic assessment, presentation of quantitative results, and discussion require substantial improvement.

1. The manuscript is presented as a case report, but it compares two socket preservation techniques. The authors should clearly state that this is a split-mouth single-patient case report
2. Include details of: PRF preparation protocol (centrifugation speed, time, centrifuge model). DFDBA characteristics (particle size, manufacturer, lot number if available). Type and dimensions of the collagen membrane/plug. Suture material and suturing technique. Implant planning protocol.
3. CBCT measurements should be described in detail, including: Measurement landmarks, Software used, Bone height and width measurements. Bone density (if assessed), Representative CBCT images with measurement lines.
4. Compare the findings with previous literature regarding DFDBA and PRF in socket preservation and explain possible biological reasons for the observed differences.
5. Conclusions are based on a single patient, statements claiming superiority of DFDBA should be more cautious. Emphasize that the findings are preliminary and cannot be generalized.
6. Correct grammatical and typographical errors throughout the manuscript.
7. Remove unnecessary repetition between the Introduction and Discussion.
8. Update the literature review with more recent references (preferably from the last 5–10 years).
9. Ensure that all references follow the journal's citation style uniformly.
10. Improve formatting of headings, spacing, and figure numbering.