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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript entitled “OUTCOME OF ROOT CANAL THERAPY IN A GENERAL DENTAL CENTRE” is a well written investigation, however there are some drawbacks that authors must answer and correct before the publication of the paper.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? No.

In the Background section authors consider synonyms “Root canal therapy” and “endodontics”. This is not correct. Authors must differentiate this two concept.

Authors state in the Introduction that the aim of this study was to determine the technical treatment outcome of root canal fillings in a Nigerian general dental clinic. On the contrary, the title of the manuscript is “OUTCOME OF ROOT CANAL THERAPY IN A GENERAL DENTAL CENTRE”? Authors do not analyze the outcome of the root canal treatment! The title must be changed accordingly.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? Yes.

However, authors must explain if the observer was calibrated. The Cohen’s kappa statistic must be mentioned.

3. Are the data sound? Yes

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? Yes

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? No.

Authors stated that “The technical outcome of root canal fillings is important for the overall health of the dentition”. This assertion is not derived of the results of this study and cannot be in the Conclusions. Authors must re-write this section including only the real conclusions of this work.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? No.

Authors must discuss the influence of coronal restoration in the outcome of root canal treatment. Moreover, authors must discuss that in this study it is not possible to analyse a possible association between the quality of root canal treatment and the treatment outcome.
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? Yes

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? No.
Authors state in the Abstract that the aim of this study was to evaluate the technical quality of root canal treatments done in general dental clinics with emphasis on the effects of professional experience of the operator, whether tooth was anterior or posterior and whether it was a maxillary or mandibular tooth. Results confirm this aim. So, the title is not in accordance with this and must be changed. A more informative and adequate title would be as follows: “Technical quality of root canal fillings in Nigeria”.

9. Is the writing acceptable? Yes.
However, authors must use the expression “root-filled teeth” in relation with teeth “ROOT CANAL FILLED TEETH”.
In Tables the abbreviations must be explained.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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