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Reviewer’s report:

This work deals with the reproducibility of conventional and digital methods to assess gingival recession. The question investigated is clear and the paper adds something of new in the knowledge of our field.

In the abstract please indicates the numerical results and introduce the use of Bland Altman plots. The introduction is clear.

Methods are well designed.

The results are confusing, the study should focus on the ICC for each examiner for each method and for the ICC for each method considering the four observers together. Hence these results should be presented first also with a test to compare statistically significant differences among the four ICC (all the observers together for the four methods). The data on the differences among observers are interesting but secondary and are useful more to discuss about the preferences of each observer. Please explain better table 3 and discuss if these differences could affect the clinical decision.

The discussion should be resembled. After the first paragraph the authors should focus on the results of the ICC after on the results and interpretation of the Bland-Altman, and after on the limits of the conventional methods and importance of intraoral scanning. Finally, on the limits of the study. Moreover, the authors might comment on the limits of the William's periodontal probe that does not allow to measures the tenths of millimeter and this can alter the results.

In Table 2 is 95% CI and not 95% ICC

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

Yes

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.

Yes

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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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