|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | |
| Book Name: | [**Medical Science: Recent Advances and Applications**](https://bookstore.bookpi.org/product/medical-science-recent-advances-and-applications-vol-1/) |
| Manuscript Number: | **Ms\_BPR\_6227** |
| Title of the Manuscript: | **FROM MACRO TO MICRO: THE RISE OF NANOPARTICLES IN ENDODONTICS** |
| Type of the Article | **Book Chapter** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| PART 1: Comments | | |
|  | Reviewer’s comment **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | Author’s Feedback *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | This manuscript offers a comprehensive overview of nanoparticles in endodontics, a rapidly advancing field with important clinical implications. By addressing their antimicrobial, regenerative, and mechanical properties, it highlights strategies to overcome key limitations of conventional therapies. It provides a valuable reference for researchers and clinicians seeking to integrate nanotechnology into more effective endodontic treatments. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | Yes, the title contains an effective hook for capturing the reader’s attention. |  |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | Yes, the content is clear and comprehensible. |  |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.** | Yes, the information presented seems scientifically accurate. |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.**  **-** | Indeed, although it is sound, the work would benefit from being updated with references from recent years, particularly 2024 and 2025. |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Yes, the manuscript is both suitable and comprehensible. |  |
| Optional/General comments | First and foremost, the authors should be acknowledged for how valuable this work is. However, although the present review is well-structured, a few refinements are necessary to ensure clarity for the reader. Overall, while the antimicrobial and regenerative prospects of these nanomaterials are evident, most evidence remains laboratory-based, and clinical translation is limited by toxicity, aggregation, stability, cost, and regulatory barriers. Including a dedicated paragraph addressing these issues at the end of the discussion would be beneficial. Furthermore, adopting a unified referencing style, clarifying terminology, and elaborating on evidence levels and risks would further strengthen the manuscript. Finally, it is essential to ensure that appropriate permissions have been obtained for the use of all figures or images included in the review. |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PART 2:** | | |
|  | Reviewer’s comment | Author’s comment *(if agreed with the reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?** | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in detail)* |  |

**Reviewer details:**

**Jose Evando da Silva-Filho, Brazil**