

Subject: [BDS] Editor Decision

Dear Dr Bhuvaneswari Natarajan:

Your submission A COMPARATIVE EVALUATION OF THE OBTURATION QUALITY IN PRIMARY MANDIBULAR MOLARS USING A NOVEL OBTURATING MATERIAL VERSUS ENDOFLAS: A DOUBLE BLINDED RANDOMIZED CLINICAL TRIAL 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 C:

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?

Yes

Is the problem significant and concisely stated?

No

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).

No conflicts of interest to declare

Rating

Interest*

Good

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

Comments to the Authors

The justification presented in the Introduction is not clearly aligned with the stated

objective of the study. The rationale should be better articulated in order to adequately support the specific aim investigated.

The eligibility criteria are well defined and appropriate for the proposed study.

The authors report that the clinical evaluator was blinded. However, it is unclear why blinding was necessary in this specific study, considering that the primary outcome is the quality of root canal obturation. Please clarify this point. Blinding may be relevant in the context of a broader clinical trial; however, its relevance to this specific outcome should be clearly justified.

The clinical protocol requires further clarification. Please specify the guidelines, previous studies, or scientific evidence on which the protocol was based.

The method of insertion differed between the obturation materials. This methodological difference is of particular concern, as it represents a potential source of bias. Please clearly explain why the pastes were introduced into the root canal using different techniques and provide a justification for this choice.

Tables 2 and 3 appear to present identical data, albeit in different formats. Please verify and correct this apparent duplication.

It is recommended that the Discussion section explicitly addresses the different paste insertion methods and provides a clear justification for this methodological choice, as it may directly influence the interpretation of the results.
