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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript assessed the effect of different laboratory training protocols for border molding. This topic is interesting and also important as it is well-known and the authors stated in the text that the number of edentulous patients that needs complete dentures is reducing in industrialized countries and there is an difficult for general dentists to fabricate and learn how to fabricate complete dentures.

Although the manuscript presents limitations that do not allow for an external validity of the results it is still interesting to be reported in the literature since there is little information on the topic. My main suggestion to the author is to re-evaluate some of the assumptions in the introduction and discussion that suggests that impression accuracy or technique "greatly affects" the quality of the dentures and the level of patient satisfaction (which is based on studies made in 1925 and 1963). A recent published systematic review (J Oral Rehabil. 2016 Oct;43(10):771-7. The importance of a two-step impression procedure for complete denture fabrication: a systematic review of the literature) concluded that a two-step impression procedure may not be mandatory for the success of conventional complete denture fabrication regarding a variety of clinical aspects of denture quality and patients' perceptions of the treatment.

Based on the aforementioned points I suggest that this paper should be subjected to a minor review before its acceptance.

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.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal