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Reviewer's report:

This is a good study on how to apply some of these restorative techniques in patients with a handicap. However, I only have just a few concerns to raise to the authors:

ESSENTIAL REVISIONS:

1. This was a comparative study between ART and conventional method in clinic environment and under GA. My suggestion to the authors is to re-look at the title of the MS to be in tandem with the study, as it stands it only means the survival of ART restorations after one year and methods applied. And this is not the case.

2. Some attention is needed to the English grammar in several parts of the MS.

3. On page 7, first paragraph, one of the inclusion criteria is “teeth with spontaneous pain and mobility”. Was that the real case?

4. Although some opening explanation has been given for allowing respondents to make choices of the method used to treat the patients, how objective was this method, given that they had to go away and return to affirm the chosen method? Could there have been the possibility of the respondents meeting each other and exchanging views before treatment, ending up with skewed outcomes as seen in the numbers for each category?

Otherwise, the MS is informative, and one would have only hopped more numbers could have been used, and the balances for each category could have been attained.

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