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ABSTRACT

* In the results we consider that there is a significant difference in the parameters of crown and gingival morphology (CGM) of the maxillary anterior teeth (MAT) affirming this information because consider in the conclusions that the CGM of the MAT of the left and right side are symmetrical existing a significant difference of both sides.

* In the methods 9 parameters are considered: gingival angle (GA), papilla width (PW), papilla height (PH), crown length (CL), crown width (CW), crown width / crown length ratio (CW / CL), bucco-lingual width of the crown (BLW), contact surface width (CSW), and contact surface height / crown length ratio (CS / CL); these 9 parameters were evaluated to determine they were significantly correlated with the periodontal biotype (PB) however in the results because sex was considered as another parameter.

* When pluralizing the abbreviations of each parameter it is not correct to add the S in each abbreviation of each parameter (example: PBs)

MATERIALS AND METHODS

* The sample was conformed by 56 participants (13 men and 43 women), as it involves studying different parameters because it was not limited to a more homogeneous sample.

* Why consider the evaluation of the periodontal biotype (PB) using the periodontal probe if in the background it is considered an unsafe method to measure the clinical parameters of gingival morphology and also subject to the disadvantages of low precision.

RESULTS

* In tabla 3 Considering a p ≤ 0.2 according to the ANOVA Test the significant difference can be determined with the following parameters: sex (p = 0.043), PH (p = 0.027), CL (p = 0.237), BLW (p = 0.61) and CSW (p = 0.462) instead those that have no significant
difference are: GA (p = 0.0), PW (p = 0.0), CW (p = 0.005), CW / CL (p = 0.0) and CS / CL (p = 0.102) which are different to those marked in the title of tabla 3 where it indicates the following: For different PBs, the CGM characteristics of the right maxillary central incisors are shown in table 3. ANOVA showed that there were significant differences in terms of sex, GA, PW, PH, CW, and CW / CL (P ≤ 0.043), but no significant differences in terms of CL, BLW, CSW, and CS / CL (P ≥ 0.102).

DISCUSSION

* If the value of p (p ≤ 0.2) according to the ANOVA Test showed a significant difference (p = 0.027) between PH and PB this value is confirmed with that of tabla 3 instead with the CW / CL parameters according to the test of ANOVA refers that there is no significant difference in contrast to what is marked in table 3 where it specifies that it has a significant difference.

* The value of the CS / CI parameter marked in this part of the article lacks the values of the standard deviation (+/- DS) as they are marked in tabla 1.
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