

Manuscript: “**Diode Laser Ablation Versus Surgical Scalpel Technique For Gingival Depigmentation: A Randomized Controlled Clinical Trial**”

Submitted: 24 July 2020

Accepted: 28 September 2020

Published: 31 October 2020

Corresponding author: Bayan Habli

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2020.v16n30p87](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2020.v16n30p87)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Abbas Taher

Reviewer 2: Monica Monea, Romania

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Monica Monea	Email:
University/Country: Romania	
Date Manuscript Received: 27.07.2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 30.07.2020
Manuscript Title: Diode Laser Ablation versus Surgical Scalpel Technique for Gingival Depigmentation: A Randomized Controlled Clinical Trial	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0822/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
The title of this paper is clear and adequate to the content of the manuscript. It clearly indicates the purpose and the methods used by the authors and also the pathology they addressed.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	5

results.	
The abstract is a very good presentation of the manuscript and the reader can have a concise idea about the protocol of the study. I gives the most important information and is very useful for the reader.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
The English language is correct, I found no grammar errors and the article is very easy to read and to understand.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
The methodology is scientifically sound, the design of the study is correct and supports the conclusions of this clinical investigations.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
I could not find errors in the body of this paper, in my opinion it is a clear description of a comparison between two clinical treatment options.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
The conclusions are credible as they are based on a good research methodology. They have also an important clinical value and could offer support for specialists in choosing the best approach for the removal of gingival pigmentation.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
The authors listed representative scientific literature data on the topic and therefore I consider that the references are correct and appropriate.	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	X
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Dear authors,

Congratulations for your research! I appreciated the design of your study, the analysis of the results and I am sure many practitioners will appreciate the conclusions of your work.