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Consequences of early extraction of compromised first permanent molar: A systematic review

The authors performed a systematically review of the literature to determine the sequelae of early extraction of compromised first permanent molars. The paper is well written and the study is of distinct clinical interest, since compromised first permanent molars (FPMs) are often associated with deficits in skeletal and dental development of children and early therapy decision may be of success. Therefore the practitioner has to weigh whether advantages or disadvantages of extractions prevail for the patient. A clinical examination can provide concrete advantages for the decision making of the clinical therapy.

Abstract

Methods:

Only articles until 2015 were reviewed, now we are late 2017. However relevant articles are already published and this article should include all relevant articles and bring something new to the reader.


Results/ Conclusion:

The authors manage to include all relevant information, however relevant p values are missing. In the "Results section" the authors should add short information on the relevant results, not only mentioning the topic, e. g. page 3 "The consequences were [...] effects on incisors." I suggest to move the results from the conclusion part to the results part.
Page 3: "Due to a lack of evidence on the outcomes and variables that influence them, high-quality prospective studies are needed." This is not very helpful for the clinician, your article wants to be a help whether early extraction of FPM’s is successful or not - therefore, I suggest to sum up the results to be as precise as possible.

Introduction

The introduction is well written and introduces the reader adequately to the clinical relevance and current state of knowledge. The hypothesis is clearly formulated.

Methods

The methodology used is adequate and conforms to current standards in systematic reviews. Due to the outdated literature, I suggest to complete the methodical analysis with current literature.

Results

The results are complete.

Discussion/Conclusions

The discussion includes the relevant literature and adequately interprets the results as well as puts them into perspective.

Due to the outdated literature and the fact, that a similar review was published in July 2017, I suggest to improve the quality and relevance of this article by adding current literature. If the article then provides relevant findings, a publication can be considered.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No
Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

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 recommend additional statistical review

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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