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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Thank You very much for providing an opportunity to review the manuscript titled “The effect of pontic design of anterior fixed dental prosthesis on phonetic function: A clinical case study”. Although the manuscript is interesting and the aim of this study is clear, however there are some questions that authors should address: 1. English language corrections need to be done, since mistakes and typos are present in the whole text. 2. It will be better to introduce X-ray images, which will be helpful to see embedded supernumerary tooth as well as roots of canines and their length inside the alveolar bone. 3. Although authors mentioned that anterior defect (toothless part) was small and canines had strong roots, however as can be seen from pictures, maxillary incisors are not positioned in a straight line. So, tipping forces can occur, which must be resisted by means of additional abutment teeth at each end and first premolars should also be used as abutment teeth. Taking into consideration this, authors should more clearly and fundamentally explain the choice of treatment plan. Why they did not include first premolar as abatement teeth? 4. Please mention the exact name of PVS material. Additionally, the whole process of FPD manufacturing should be explained. Which technology was used? Which scanner and software was used? Pontic design fabrication should be clearly presented. Was ceramic veneering or glazing applied? Since texture or rough surface also can have some influence on phonetics, in my opinion. 5. Authors must explain why they choose zinc polycarbonoxylate cement as temporary cement. In some literature it can be found that this cement is permanent. Was it easy to remove FPD every time without damaging tooth structure or prothetic construction? Why authors did not use other temporary cement? 6. Under “Articulation test and procedure”
heading/subheading authors should mention which vowels and voiceless fricatives were tested. They should mention why those letters were selected and not the others? Moreover, 5 typical words also should be highlighted. 7. In “Results” section there is no information about all letters that were tested. Authors should include information about every letter that was tested. 8. Although authors mentioned that the phonetic function of anterior fixed dental prostheses (FDPs) with different pontic designs remains unknown, however there can be various similar studies which results should be discussed and compared with obtained data in “Discussion” section. 9. Authors should add Conclusion in the end of study. In Abstract, as a conclusion, authors talk about provisional restorations, which somehow is not clear. Although provisional restorations also can affect speech, however material of provisional restorations are different (zirconia cannot be used as provisional) so conclusion is not supported by the results. Maybe some modification of the conclusion need to be done. Based on the above-mentioned considerations and concerns, I suggest to reconsider your manuscript after major revision.
Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 67766

Title: Influence of pontic design of anterior fixed dental prosthesis on speech: A clinical case study

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 05809529

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: Egypt

Author’s Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-05-04

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-05-09 20:21

Reviewer performed review: 2021-05-17 16:56

Review time: 7 Days and 20 Hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific quality</th>
<th>Grade A: Excellent</th>
<th>Grade B: Very good</th>
<th>Grade C: Good</th>
<th>Grade D: Fair</th>
<th>Grade E: Do not publish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language quality</td>
<td>Grade A: Priority publishing</td>
<td>Grade B: Minor language polishing</td>
<td>Grade C: A great deal of language polishing</td>
<td>Grade D: Rejection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>Accept (High priority)</td>
<td>Accept (General priority)</td>
<td>Minor revision</td>
<td>Major revision</td>
<td>Rejection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-review</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

- Page 3 lines 4 and 5: remove this part (The phonetic function of anterior fixed dental prostheses (FDPs) with different pontic designs remains unknow.)
- Page 3 line 13: (Or) means that you did one of the two, either immediately or one week later. But, you did both, so write (and) instead of (or).
- Page 3 line 17: (Slight) is unmeasurable word you can replace it with (insignificant).
- Page 5 lines 6, 7 and 8: Rewrite this paragraph. I suggest; (As dental implant treatment may suffer from anatomical or economic limitations of patients. So removable partial denture (RPD) and tooth-supported fixed dental prosthesis (FDP) are primary alternations in specific cases).
- Page 6 lines 19 and 22: Correct spelling (supernumerary)
- Page 7 line 3: Rewrite, I suggest; (and two types of zirconia FDPs, one with saddle pontic and one with modified ridge lap pontic were fabricated)
- Page 7 line 11: write (and) instead of (or).
- Page 7 lines 18, 19 and 20: give full details about your speech sample. -Mention the used 6 vowels -Mention the used 8 fricatives -Mention the used 5 words Write all of them phonetically (this is mandatory).
- Page 8 line 6: What is your rational for using the upper boundary frequency?
- Concerning statistics: To do your statistics you need standard values to compare your patient results to them. What are your standard values for formants and the upper boundary frequency? Is it the patient own results while wearing the removable device? Or you had a control (normal person)? Or what?
- Including the tables of your statistics provide a better understanding to your results.
- Page 8 line 25: You mentioned earlier that you did 8 voiceless fricatives. But here you stated that the total were 5 voiceless fricatives. Make it clear is it 8 or 5? and unify your words. -you mentioned only 3 fricatives /f/, /s/ and /ʃ/ what about the other fricatives?
line 6: What do you mean by (could)? Did you analyze it after 1 week or you didn’t?

-Page 9 line 17: the sentence (an immediate or short-term) use (and) instead of (or)
-Page 9 lines 23 and 24: the sentence (During the pronunciation of /u/ while wearing S-FDP and M-FDP) has no meaning, remove it.
-Page 9 lines 27 and 28: Rewrite, I suggest; (Nevertheless, the effect of FDP on other vowels was insignificant, because….)

-Page 10 line 1: Unify the used terms. Use (consonants).
-Page 10 line 12: the sentence (However, the consonant distortion could be recovered) remove (could be).
-Page 10 line 14 Use the word (abnormal) instead of (unnormal).
-Page 10 line 15 Rewrite, the sentence (Since the modified ridge lap pontic slightly contact the alveolar ridge, there will be ….) I suggest; (Since the modified ridge lap pontic has incomplete contact to the alveolar ridge…)
-Page 10 line 16: Use (Palate) instead of (palatal) in the sentence (there will be a concave space between the lingual surface of teeth and the palatal,).
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Thank You very much for thorough revision of manuscript titled “Influence of pontic design of anterior fixed dental prosthesis on speech: A clinical case study”. Authors addressed all concerns of Reviewer and improved manuscript greatly. Comments for Minor Revision: 1. Under subheading “Articulation test and procedure” check the name of cement. There is written zinc polycarbonoxylate cement. It should be Zinc polycarboxylate. 2. It will be interesting for a reader to see which type of FPD (saddle pontic design or modified ridge lap pontic design) was used as a final. Please mention also what kind of permanent cement was used for final fixation of restoration. 3. Some typos are still exist which need to be corrected during proofreading. I highly recommend to Accept manuscript in its current form and congratulate the authors for this valuable scientific work.