Reviewer’s report

Title: Comparison of the accuracy of different impression procedures in case of multiple and angulated implants

Version: 0 Date: 20 Nov 2019

Reviewer: Lisiane Bernardi

Reviewer's report:

General Points

The aim of the study "Comparison of the accuracy of different impression procedures in case of multiple angulated implants" was to evaluate the effects of impression variables (impression level (abutment/implant), impression coping (hexed/non-hex), splinting or nonsplinting the copings) on the accuracy of impression in the case of 6 implants placed in edentulous maxillary arch. The issue is relevant, the design of the study is well defined, and the discussion addresses the positive points and limitations of study design. However, some points may be better clarified.

1. The authors commented that all impression procedures were performed by a single clinician (M.W.R.). As, one only researcher performed the assay, I think would be important to demonstrated the reproducibility of measures. It should be important to repeat some set of impressions after at least one week and compare both measures and maybe calculate Kappa value.

2. The authors showed in the tables the values obtained from coronal and angular deviation in the results and discussion. Are the significant differences found in the laboratory relevant in the clinic? Would the authors recommend any of the techniques? I think it would be interesting for the authors to add a paragraph about this translating the laboratory trial to the clinic in the discussion.

3. The text contains some spelling errors. Please review it.
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