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Reviewer's report:

Aim
This was reasonable given the intro of RA into Brazil recently. Though perhaps it might have been more useful to interview dentists who didn't use RA and why.

Sample
What does "not localised mean" in the study design section - that they couldn't determine the address?

Design - appropriate

Outcome measures
Well designed questionnaire

Results
SO how many dentists out of the original possible sample actually took part - 136 of 652 is not 48%

And do the authors believe that showing that RA usage is associated with RA acquisition is an interesting finding? Or that people who use RA more frequently are more likely to view it favourably?

The first line of the conclusion is not supported by this study. Given that 76% of respondents report that they use RA sometimes or often, why do they state in the conclusion that RA is used infrequently?

Reporting

Background
On the background authors suggest that the high cost of RA may be a barrier to its uptake. They then use the US as an example of where invasive procedures are undertaken under GA instead. This is not the case. RA is not suitable for multiple invasive procedures. And the authors should provide data supporting the cost argument - is RA cheaper than GA? is RA cheaper than multiple drug sedation? It probably is.
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