

Comments:

1. In the abstract, the research objectives do not match the conclusion. And the objectives in the abstract are not the same as the objectives written in the full paper.

Note:

In Abstract

Background. This study aimed to evaluate the **load capacity** of maxillary central incisors with simulated flared root canal restored with different fiber-reinforced composite (FRC) post and resin cement.

Conclusion. Within the limitation of the study, it can be concluded that prefabricated FRC posts outperform DIS-FRC posts in terms of **the load capacity** of a maxillary central incisor with a simulated flared root canal. The cementation methods whether a self-adhesive or self-etch adhesive resin cement, was not demonstrated to influence the load capacity of a maxillary central incisor with a flared root canal. There were no significant differences between favorable and non-favorable **fracture patterns** when FRC post systems were used to restore a maxillary central incisor with a flared root canal.

In Full Paper

Therefore, this study aims to investigate: i) **the load capacity** of the maxillary central incisor with flared canals restored with different chairside FRC posts ii) the load capacity of the maxillary central incisor with flared canals restored cemented with either self-adhesive or self-etch resin cement, and iii) the **mode of failure** of the maxillary central incisors restored with different techniques.

2. In the Discussion, we do not see enough discussion about Figures 3,4 and 5. And, what can be concluded from Figures 3,4, and 5?