Dear Juliana Ignacio de Oliveira, Marina Kfouri, Simone Saldanha Ignacio de Oliveira, Emily Freitas da Silva, Márcio Katsuyoshi Mukai, Newton Sesma, Dalva Cruz Laganá:

Your submission Patient-Reported Outcome Measures Between Digital And Conventional Splints For Bruxism: A Systematic Review 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,

Sergio Eduardo de Paiva Gonçalves EDITOR-IN-CHIEF São Paulo State University (Unesp), Institute of Science and Technology, São José dos Campos, SP

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?

No

Is the problem significant and concisely stated?

Yes

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

Yes

Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the results?

No

Is adequate reference made to other work in the field?

Yes

Is the language acceptable?

No

Manuscript Structure

Length of article is:*

Adequate

Number of tables is:

Adequate

Number of figures is:

Adequate

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*

Excellent

Quality

Good

Originality

Excellent

Overall

Good

Recommendation

Major Revision

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

Yes

Comments

Comments to the Author

The manuscript entitled "Patient-Reported Outcome Measures Between Digital and Conventional Splints for Bruxism: A Systematic Review" addresses an important and timely topic. The integration of CAD-CAM workflows in occlusal splint therapy is highly relevant in

contemporary dentistry. The review is generally well-structured, follows PRISMA guidelines, and the topic fits the scope of the journal. The inclusion of only randomized clinical trials focusing on bruxism, excluding mixed TMD populations, is a strength. Nevertheless, there are several issues that should be addressed before the manuscript can be considered for publication.

1. Abstract and conclusions: The abstract currently overstates the findings. Given the heterogeneity of the included studies and the low to very low certainty of evidence for several outcomes (Table 4), the conclusions should be more cautious, emphasizing the limited and preliminary nature of the evidence.

2. Methods – eligibility criteria: The exclusion of TMD patients is mentioned, but the actual diagnostic methods for bruxism across studies were heterogeneous (clinical diagnosis vs. EMG–ECG). Please clarify how this variability was handled and whether it may affect the generalizability of the results.

3. Risk of bias and certainty of evidence: The RoB-2 assessment shows that two studies were at high risk of bias, yet this is not sufficiently emphasized in the Results and Discussion. The certainty of evidence (GRADE) is low or very low for most PROMs, and this must be highlighted more consistently in the Discussion and Conclusion.

4. Outcome heterogeneity: PROMs were assessed using different tools (VAS, OHIP-14, T-Scan, etc.), and the comparator splints varied considerably in materials and thickness. This heterogeneity should be discussed in greater depth, particularly regarding its implications for clinical practice and for interpreting PROMs.

5. Discussion – EMG findings: The study by Bargellini et al. showed that conventional splints were more effective in reducing tonic contractions. This important finding is mentioned but not adequately discussed. The authors should reflect more critically on why digital splints may not always be superior.

6. Figures and tables: Figure 2 (risk of bias) should be improved in clarity (font size, colors). In Tables 2 and 3, abbreviations (e.g., sMMA, VAS) should be defined in footnotes for clarity. In Table 4 the outcomes were not identified.

1. Language and style: The manuscript is generally understandable but requires editing for grammar, conciseness, and fluency. For instance, avoid redundancies such as "significant difference was observed with both splints" (Table 3). Replace informal terms such as "smaller time was spent" with more precise wording ("less time was required").

2. Abstract – Materials and Methods: State explicitly that the review was registered in PROSPERO (registration number). This is currently only present in the Portuguese abstract and main text, not in the English abstract.

3. Consistency in terminology: Use "occlusal stabilization splints (OSS)" consistently throughout the text, as sometimes the abbreviation is omitted.

Reviewer B:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

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?

Yes

Is the problem significant and concisely stated?

Yes

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

Yes

Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the results?

Yes

Is adequate reference made to other work in the field?

Yes

Is the language acceptable?

Yes

Manuscript Structure

Length of article is:*

Adequate

Number of tables is:

Adequate

Number of figures is:

Adequate

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).

Rating

Interest*

Excellent

Quality

Good

Originality

Good

Overall

Good

Recommendation

Accept

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

No

Comments

Comments to the Author

The topic covered is current and relevant, which makes it of great interest to readers.