Brazilian Dental Science

Subject: [BDS] Editor Decision

Dear Mr., Dr., Prof., Prof., Maria Cortes:

Your submission The influence of carbonated hydroxyapatite on pre osteogenics promoters on a bone cement: The carbonated hydroxyapatite on a bone cement to Brazilian Dental Science, has been revised and according to reviewers' comments, there are questions to be addressed and/or points to be clarified/corrected.
Please answer the reviewers considerations point-by-point in a separate document and also please make all the corrections in the text highlighted in yellow.

Deadline: 30 days

Thank you for considering Brazilian Dental Science for publishing your research.
We are looking forward the revised version of you manuscript.

Sincerely,

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

Questionnaire

Does the manuscript contain new and significant information to justify publication?*

Yes

Does the Abstract (Summary) clearly and accurately describe the content of the article?

Brazilian Dental Science

No

Is the problem significant and concisely stated?

Yes

Are the methods or research design described comprehensively? Is the statistical analysis adequate?

No

Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the results?

No

Is adequate reference made to other work in the field?

No

Is the language acceptable?

Yes

Manuscript Structure

Length of article is:*

Adequate

Number of tables is:

Adequate

Number of figures is:

Adequate

Brazilian Dental Science

Please state any conflict(s) of interest that you have in relation to the review of this paper (state "none" if this is not applicable).

None

Rating

Interest*

Good

Quality

Below Average

Originality

Good

Overall

Below Average

Recommendation

Major Revision

Would you be willing to review a revision of this manuscript?

Yes

Comments

Comments to the Author

The study presents scientific relevance and potential interest for the field of biomaterials for bone regeneration. However, in order for the manuscript to be

considered for acceptance, the revisions and modifications suggested should be adequately addressed by the authors.

Reviewer B:

The article looks original and relevant.

As for me, the chapter of **Materials and Methods** is too big. If the examination methods are not original but previously described there is no need to give such a long explanation. The **Aim** and **Objectives** are located in the **Discussion** chapter which is not typical for the article's structure. Also, the **Objectives** in the **Abstract** are different from **Objectives i**n the main text.

Recommendation: Revisions Required
