



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 37581

**Title:** Comparison of clinical survivals of two different tooth-coloured post systems which restored by direct composite restorations

**Reviewer’s code:** 03845514

**Reviewer’s country:** Turkey

**Science editor:** Na Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2017-12-29

**Date reviewed:** 2017-12-29

**Review time:** 2 Hours

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

**COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

I recommend that you continue your work in this area by adding new materials in the future



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 37581

**Title:** Comparison of clinical survivals of two different tooth-coloured post systems which restored by direct composite restorations

**Reviewer’s code:** 03845515

**Reviewer’s country:** Turkey

**Science editor:** Na Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2017-12-29

**Date reviewed:** 2017-12-29

**Review time:** 3 Hours

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

**COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

In this study, patient follow-ups are a difficult and laborious process. I suggest that authors should continue their self-sacrificing work.



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 37581

**Title:** Comparison of clinical survivals of two different tooth-coloured post systems which restored by direct composite restorations

**Reviewer's code:** 02844078

**Reviewer's country:** Turkey

**Science editor:** Na Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2017-12-29

**Date reviewed:** 2017-12-30

**Review time:** 13 Hours

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It is a well documented clinical study, 36 months period is really high in clinical conditions. Your manuscript is valuable for clinical studies and scientific notifications.

Review of manuscript titled: "Comparison of clinical survivals of two different tooth-colored post systems which restored by direct composite restorations. This article appears to be suitable for publication, if the following editorial revisions are made to improve the quality of English grammar and comprehension, as follows:

#### TITLE

1. Title change from: "Comparison of clinical survivals of two different tooth-coloured post systems which restored by direct composite restorations." To: "Comparison of the clinical efficacy of two different types of post systems which were restored with composite restorations."

#### ABSTRACT

2. AIM Change: "Although retrospective studies have reported good clinical performance for the use of crown coverage after tooth build-up, the performance of restorations using fibre posts and direct resin composite has not been adequately studied. This study reports the results of a prospective clinical trial that compared the performance of polyethylene and zirconia-rich glass fibre posts." To: "The efficacy of resin composite restorations using fiber posts are controversial, although some retrospective studies have reported excellent results, there remains some concerns about their longevity. The purpose of this clinical trial was to compare the efficacy of resin composite restorations, retained with either polyethylene or zirconia-rich glass fiber posts."
3. CONCLUSION Change: "Within the application possibilities of this study it can be concluded that there is no difference in the outcome after restoration of endodontically treated teeth with zirconia-rich glass fiber and polyethylene fiber posts and direct composite resin restoration." To: The efficacy of resin composite restorations, retained with either polyethylene or zirconia-rich glass fiber posts were similar, suggesting that both types of fiber post can be used successfully to help retain resin composite restorations."

#### INTRODUCTION

4. Change: "No clinically significant tooth fracture was seen when the endodontically treated teeth were restored with a fiber post [2,6-8]." To: "These systems have become successful because few tooth fractures were observed after endodontically treated teeth were restored with a fiber post [2,6-8]."

#### METHODS AND MATERIALS

5. Please look at the wording on page 5: "Treatment and recall protocols were approved by the Ethical Committee of the University of Dicle, Faculty of Dentistry, Turkey. Informed consent was obtained from the subjects before enrolment in the clinical evaluation." Was written consent from the subjects obtained? It is an IRB requirement to comply with Western IRB standards. The human subjects were aged as young as 15 years. The IRB standard is that children younger than 18 years, must also have a parent or guardian consent. Was the parent / guardian consent obtained? - It does not appear so from the sentence "Treatment and recall protocols were approved by the Ethical

Committee of the University of Dicle, Faculty of Dentistry, Turkey. Informed consent was obtained from the patients before enrolment in the clinical evaluation.” Was was the IRB approval number?

6. Page 5 what was the name, type manufacturer of the post bonding agent?

## RESULTS

7. The opening sentence to the results needs to be changed to improve its clarity for the reader. Please change: “Tables 1 5 show the findings obtained at 6, 12, 24, and 36 months of follow-up observation. No patient dropped out of the study.” To: “After the teeth were restored with a polyethylene or zirconia-rich glass fiber posts and resin composite restorations the presence of periapical lesions, marginal leakage, surface staining, crown retention and color stability were assessed at 6, 12, 24, and 36 months (Tables 1 to 5). None of the subjects dropped out of this study.”

## DISCUSSION

8. Page 8. The opening sentence to the discussion needs to be changed to improve its clarity for the reader. Opening paragraphs don't begin with “because.” Please Change: “Because a post does not strengthen an endodontically treated tooth and the preparation of a post space may increase the risk of root fracture and treatment failure, the decision to use a post in a given clinical situation must be made judiciously[9]. Anterior teeth with minimal structural loss may be conservatively treated with a bonded restoration in the access cavity[15]. Whitening treatments and veneer placement can be used to address tooth discolouration[9].” To: “Many dentists use minimally invasive dentistry to avoid inserting posts in endodontically treated teeth [15]. The use of posts, requires the removal of tooth structure, which may increase the risk of root fracture and tooth discoloration. However, posts can be necessary to retain large resin composite restorations [9] when it is not possible to provide minimally invasive dental procedures [15], and whitening treatments or veneers can be used if a tooth becomes discolored.”
9. Page 10. Please change the summary sentence: “In summary, after 36 months of follow-up observation, 62 endodontically treated central incisors with partial crown loss that had been restored with polyethylene fibre or zirconia-rich glass fibre posts and direct resin composite exhibited favourable clinical outcomes. The combined use of fibre posts and composite materials is an efficient alternative to conventional courses of treatment for endodontically treated anterior teeth.” To match the abstract: “In summary, the efficacy of resin composite restorations, retained with either polyethylene or zirconia-rich glass fiber posts were similar, suggesting that both types of fiber post can be used successfully to help retain resin composite restorations.”

## FIGURES

10. Acceptable

## REFERENCES

11. Acceptable.