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Reviewer's report:

It is with gratitude that I accept to review your paper entitled “Outcome of root canal therapy in a general dental centre”. I appreciate the effort required to compose a paper like this.

The analysis of quality of treatments produced by general practitioners is very important and we have few works like this. I congratulate the authors for their good work and their clear and objective wording. However, I recommend major compulsory revisions to make the article even better.

MAJOR COMPULSORY REVISIONS

Title

Actually, the study doesn’t involved outcome, but quality of fillings. To use "outcome", the status of periradicular tissues should be verified. I suggest you should substitute "outcome" for "quality".

Patients and Methods

It seems that two criteria were used in the study: Unal et al. 2011 and ESE 1994. It’s confusing to the reader. The ESE document is broad and the authors did not specified the criteria used. I think that the authors should use just the Unal criteria. It’s more recent, specific and is more clear on the text. Furthermore, the GQEW and NGQEW abbreviations were used by Unal. Therefore, it’s clear to me that the Unal reference is preferable.

Discussion P.10

I suggest you should substitute "technical outcome" for “technical quality”. All practitioners are from the same institution, the Army Dental Centre. There would be better if the general practitioners were from different centers.

Conclusion P.11

I suggest you should substitute "technical outcome" for “technical quality”. The conclusions cannot wording like results. I think that the authors should rewrite the conclusion removing the values.

MINOR ESSENTIAL REVISIONS

Abstract P.2
“Retrospective study of case notes and periapical radiographs of patients seen between 2008 and 2011 for patients with completed root canal fillings”. Please, clarify this sentence.

Background P. 4
The reference 4 does not support the first paragraph. I think you can change for reference 6.

Conclusion P.11
Incidentally, the value for GQEW is 53.2% in conclusion and 53.1 in the abstract. The acceptable length of root canal fillings is different too.

References
The name of journals needs put in italic and the title and volume in bold. See examples of the BMC Oral Health reference style.

Figure 1
I suggest you remove figure 1. There was not statistical difference between anterior and posterior teeth and the graph can influence the reader. One table it’s preferable. It can be merged with table 2.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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