Article Review: Comparison of selective laser melting and stereolithography etching templates for guided endodontics (#97160)

1. Basic Reporting

The article is well grounded scientifically, bringing an innovative question. However, there are errors throughout the text, such as repeated sentences in the methodology, and the writing itself is not sufficiently robust and is difficult to interpret. Regarding the attached figures, Figure 1 is included, but there is no reference to it anywhere in the text.

2. Experimental Design

The research question is well defined, I believe it to be relevant and innovative, since guided access in endodontics is a growing area and must be taken into account due to the difficulty in resolving some cases due to access to root canals.

The methodology contains repeated phrases throughout the text, in addition to being difficult to interpret, and some of the figures from the experiment can be cited for better understanding by the reader. Furthermore, there is no basis for choosing the number of teeth, with no sample calculation or previous studies to arrive at the number of teeth chosen for the study.

3. Validity of the Findings

The results are well explained, however during the discussion the author mentions the difficulty of clinical applicability due to the height of the device and, therefore, difficulty in viewing and accessing the root canals. Furthermore, he reports that due to the size of the guide, the patient may feel discomfort during the procedure and may not accept the procedure as well. Another important factor is the fact that absolute isolation cannot be performed during treatment, so the

conclusion that suggests clinical applicability is hasty, given that there are still gaps to be studied.

4. General Comments

There are some gaps in the study, such as a lack of clarity in the methodology, especially in the choice of teeth and the number of specimens. Furthermore, the device is proposed for teeth that present some type of calcification and not all specimens had this anatomy.

Methodology could be better written.

5. Confidential notes to the editor

No addiotional comments.