Author’s response to reviews

Title: Factors influencing incidents of complications while using Nickel-Titanium rotary instruments for root canal treatment; a questionnaire study

Authors:
Ahmad Madarati (ahmad.madarati@hotmail.co.uk)

Version: 2 Date: 23 Aug 2019

Author’s response to reviews:

A point-by-point response letter

The author would like to thank the Editorial Office agents, the Reviewers, Associate Editors and the Editor-in-Chief for the efforts they have made in dealing with this manuscript and for their constructive comments, questions raised and suggestions which definitely will strengthen the manuscript.

Editor Comments:
1. Please move the Keywords to under the Abstract.

The author response: Keywords have been moved to the new suggested place.

Reviewer comment:
Ahmed Jamleh (Reviewer 1): The stated problems are clear but I don't think they were all studied in this paper. For example, the raised question (To what extent could the improvements in NiTi-RIs have minimized complications during root canal cleaning and shaping?) is not answered in this survey! Furthermore, I cannot see any data about the importance of glide-path you stated. This paraph needs attention.

The author response:
The study has addressed these two points clearly three times. The results section included clearly the percentage of NiTi-RI Fracture Incidents and Associated Factors. The results showed that the majority (87.7%) experienced NiTi-RIs fractures at least once since they started using them (p<0.001). These results were in Table 4. I do believe this such results clearly show that in spite of improvements in NiTi-RIs, the problem is still existing. Moreover, two subheading results titled “Comparison of Fracture of Different Instruments) (Table 5)” which compared fracture incidents among different endodontic instruments as well as “NiTi-RI Complications versus Hand Files” (Table 3). I believe these three parts of results clearly answer the point which the reviewer raised.

Regarding Glide path preparation, the sentences was deleted from the introduction section.
METHOD
Reviewer comment: It is stated that the survey was sent to all endodontist. How systematic sampling was achieved in this study?

The author response: The systematic sampling was done ONLY for GDs not for endodontists. The sentence (in M&M section) clearly shows this. “The 600 GDs were randomly selected using a systematic sampling method [9,11], and the questionnaire was electronically emailed to the 600 GDs and all endodontists …..”

RESULTS
Reviewer comment: In Table 1, values in the last column looks different
The author response: Values were revised and they are correct

Reviewer comment: In Tables 1 and 2, you use round brackets () and box brackets []. What is the difference?
The author response: as it is stated clearly below the two tables, the values in brackets are percentages of respondents who were use NiTi-RIs which is different from the other values that represent the variables being tested.

Reviewer comment: No comparison is shown in Tables 3 and 5. Please rephrase the table descriptions
The author response: Both tables contained results of two questions which were written clearly within the two tables. The two questions are: “Which Instruments Caused More Complications (%)” in table 3 and the other question in table 5 is: “Which instruments fractured more? (%).” The question word “which” and the word “more” mean comparisons.

Reviewer comment: In Table 6, add “total” in the last raw
The author response: the word Total has been added

Reviewer comment: In Table 6, replace the description with "Table 6 Frequency of factors associated with the number of fractured NiTi-RIs (%)"
The author response: The sentence has been replaced according to reviewer suggestion.

DISCUSSION
Reviewer comment: A reference is needed for this statement: "In Saudi Arabia, routine usage of NiTi-RIs is implemented in the endodontic postgraduate programmes' curricula. Hence, endodontic postgraduate students or residents were classified as endodontists"
The author response: Though this is well known in Saudi Arabia, unfortunately the author struggles to find a reference. The author himself was a supervisor in one of these programme and also, he knew about the all other programmes in different training centers by personal communications. Therefore, the sentence has been revised according to reviewer request.

Reviewer comment: Line 50, 1st paragraph: replace "reuses" with "uses"
The author response: the words has been replaced.

Reviewer comment: Line 52, 1st paragraph: delete "most or"
The author response: they have been deleted.

Reviewer comment: Line 51-53, 4th paragraph: I cannot understand this sentence "The author believed that the further analysis of the data related to the number of fractured NiTi-RIs that the participants experienced since they began using them would reveal..."
The author response: The sentence has been revised so its better understood.

CONCLUSION
Reviewer comment: Replace "misshape" with "mishap"
The author response: The word has been replaced.

Meric Karapinar Kazandag (Reviewer 3): No further comments.

Giovanni Veronesi (Reviewer 4):
Reviewer comment: The author has reponded to all my previous concerns. However, with reference to my point #4, I suggest deleting the added sentences "The main null hypothesis were: 1... 2.....". The modified version of the previous sentence ("the aim of the questionnaire...influencing factors") clarifies the study aims.
The author response: The sentence has been deleted as suggested.