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Reviewer's report:

The author attempts to investigate the complications associated with the use of niti rotary instruments and explore the influencing factors. Although the topic is interesting and within the scope of the journal, this questionnaire study suffers from several relevant shortcomings. In general, the English requires attention and the clinical significance of the results remains unclear. A big confusion about the result analysis is shown.

Please find my comments including but not limited to:

INTRODUCTION
L24-27 the sentence is not clear
L28 add "most of" before "NiTi instruments"
L46 Add reference after "countries"
L51 and L53 The cited references (2009 and 2012) are not recent!!!!!
The problem statement is not clear

METHODOLOGY
L4 What do you mean by Google Drive tool?
How you tested correlation? Did you only use Chi-Square test?
L15 replace (p=0.05) with at a significance level of 5%

RESULTS
L25 please define "others"
L27-35 the sentences are ambiguous and need rephrasing
Table 1 Revise the number as most of the total numbers are Wrong!
Table 2 What are these? numbers or percentages? what do they reflect?
L41 and L51 replace "preformed" with "performing"
L59 what do you mean here?
Again how did you measure correlation in the results?

DISCUSSION
Move the first paragraph to the end
Start the discussion section with summarizing what you found
You need to elaborate more on the complications of niti usage
Paragraph 2 L36 what are these percentages??
Paragraph 2 L42 "6-10 or 2-5 uses" expression is confusing!
Paragraph 2 L57-60 the numbers look too big!!
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.

Unable to assess

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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