

Subject: [BDS] Editor Decision

Dear Clébio Domingues da Silveira Júnior , Morgana Guilherme de Castro Silverio,
Rafael Zetehaku Araújo, Helder Henrique Machado de Menezes , Flávio
Domingues das Neves :

Your submission Short dental implants in posterior single crowns: a five-year
follow-up of descriptive trial study 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: See Comments

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:

Too Long

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

Good

Originality

Below Average

Overall

Good

Comments

Comments to the Author

I have some recommendations to lend more validity and importance from a scientific standpoint:

-I recommend that the initial section include the implant's characteristics, such as its surface treatment, thread structure, and, in parentheses, the specific implant reference. Currently, at first glance, emphasis is placed on the brand name, which is inappropriate as it compromises objectivity.

-Specifically, regarding Table 2, the demographic information for implant placement, it's unclear when horizontal and vertical bone loss occurs.

-In Figure 2, I recommend a detailed description of the procedure in each of the sub-images.

-The calibration process should be specified.

I believe a table correlating bone loss with crown height and transmucosal area is missing.

Reviewer H:

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?

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).

None

Rating

Interest*

Good

Quality

Good

Originality

Good

Overall

Good

Comments

Comments to the Author

Dear Author,

The manuscript should be enhanced and resubmitted based on the constructive criticism provided in the attached file.

Regards,

Reviewer
