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Reviewer's report:

Manuscript OHEA-D-17-00231 entitled "The complete digital workflow in fixed prosthodontics: A systematic review" which we had submitted to BMC Oral Health

Reviewer 1:

Murilo Feres

This is a valuable and extremely relevant SR. However, there are few points that might be addressed before publication, in this reviewer's opinion.

For instance, English professional revision is highly advisable.

Answer: An English professional revision was performed by a native speaker.

Reviewer's reply:

Some PRISMA statement requirements should have been followed, as follows:

* Include Background section in the Abstract, if editorial guidelines allow you to.

Answer: A Background section was added in the Abstract.

* Include study appraisal and synthesis methods in the Abstract.

Answer: Study appraisal and synthesis methods were added in the Abstract.

* Was your systematic review (SR) registered? If so, please include protocol number. If not, please report that.

Answer: The SR was not registered; a statement was added in the Introduction.

Reviewer's reply: There is no need to include key words in the Abstract. Study appraisal (Cochrane Risk of Bias Tool) and synthesis methods (descriptive) are still missing. Please transfer the non-registration information to the M&M section.
One of the main concerns of this reviewer refers to the database/sources that have been searched.

Was MEDLINE the only data source searched? Please consider extending your search to other databases as well, such as Embase, Scopus, and Web of Sciences. In addition, consider including grey literature sources, such as Google Scholar or theses and dissertations databases. Finally, consider consulting RCT register bases for ongoing studies.

Answer: Thank you for this point. The sources of the systematic search were PubMed, EMBASE, plus grey literature by means of Google Scholar plus a manual search of the team of authors. Additional information was provided in M&M.

Reviewer's reply: After broadening your search, wasn't any other document identified and selected?

There might be a significant issue related to this SR. Since so few studies were included (3), is this SR supposed to be performed anyway? Since this is a timely topic, which requires close scientific attention, why don't you consider broadening your selection criteria so non-RCTs are included too? Even though RCTs do provide the best evidence (when it comes to treatment size effects), non-RCTs might be, somehow, useful too.

Answer: Thank you very much for your valuable comment. The SR was performed in the frame of a couple of SRs related to the Consensus Meeting of the 'Digital Dental Society' (DDS). The DDS defined the (overall) selection criteria using only clinical studies with an evidence level of RCTs.

In addition, the team of authors believes that is even worth to demonstrate the lack of evidence in the field of complete digital prosthodontic workflows. The industrial progress seems to be faster than the scientific evidence. From our point of view, this is an import result as well.

Reviewer's reply: Please reinforce your point of view in the Discussion section.

Please refer to edited pdf file for further suggestions.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
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