REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: 50083   Date: 30/01/25

Title: Survey of the usage of endodontic instruments

Recommendation:
Accept as it is ....Yes........................
Accept after minor revision.................
Accept after major revision ....
Do not accept (*Reasons below*) ....

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality	●			
Techn. Quality	●			
Clarity	●			
Significance	●			

Reviewer Name: Dr. Sireesha Kuruganti   **Date:** 30/01/25

Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

(*To be published with the manuscript in the journal*)

The reviewer is requested to provide a brief comment (3-4 lines) highlighting the significance, strengths, or key insights of the manuscript. This comment will be Displayed in the journal publication alongside with the reviewers name.

.. Strengths: Well-structured study with relevant statistical analyses and comparisons to existing literature.

Weaknesses: Lack of justification for statistical tests, redundancy in discussion, and limited actionable recommendations.

Final Recommendation: Moderate revisions required before publication.

....

....

....

Detailed Reviewer's Report

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Title and Abstract

Title: The title is clear and informative but could be more specific regarding the scope of challenges and solutions presented in the study.

Abstract (Lines 2–21):

The abstract concisely presents the aim, materials, methods, results, and conclusion. However, it lacks specific numerical data, making it less informative for quick reference.

The conclusion (Lines 15–19) suggests a need for further education and training, but it does not specify any actionable recommendations.

Suggestions:

Include more quantitative findings in the abstract.

Add a sentence on potential policy implications.

Introduction (Lines 22–36)

The introduction effectively outlines the importance of machine-driven endodontic instruments and their benefits.

The problem statement (Lines 30–36) is well-articulated but could be improved by adding a sentence on previous studies in Bulgaria or globally to provide context.

The justification for the study is present but needs a stronger emphasis on its significance in improving dental education or patient outcomes.

Suggestions:

Provide additional background on previous research in Bulgaria or similar regions.

Strengthen the rationale by discussing the practical implications of increased adoption of machine-driven instruments.

Materials and Methods (Lines 37–47)

REVIEWER'S REPORT

The study design is clear, and the data collection method (Lines 44–46) is well described.

The study population (dentists in Bulgaria) is relevant, but it is unclear whether any exclusion criteria were applied.

The statistical tests (Lines 46–47) are appropriate, but there is no justification for why the Chi-square and Fisher's exact tests were selected.

Suggestions:

Define the inclusion/exclusion criteria more explicitly.

Justify the choice of statistical tests with references to relevant methodological literature.

Results (Lines 49–122)

The demographic breakdown (Lines 61–73) is well-structured and provides a clear understanding of the study population.

The analysis of machine-driven instrument usage (Lines 75–106) is detailed but would benefit from additional comparisons with previous studies.

The results (Lines 108–122) indicate a preference for older systems, but the discussion lacks any hypothesis on why this trend exists.

Suggestions:

Include comparisons with past studies to highlight differences or similarities in instrument usage.

Add a brief discussion on potential reasons why older technologies remain dominant.

Discussion (Lines 124–170)

The discussion section effectively compares findings with previous research but could be more structured.

The authors cite multiple studies (Lines 127–170), which strengthens their argument, but there is some redundancy in discussing clinician preferences.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

The discussion lacks insight into how the findings could inform policy changes or training programs.

Suggestions:

Structure the discussion to include subheadings for clarity.

Reduce redundancy in literature comparisons.

Provide concrete recommendations for improving adoption of newer technologies.

Conclusion (Lines 172–182)

The conclusion effectively summarizes the key findings but is somewhat repetitive.

The statement on the need for awareness (Lines 177–181) is important but should be linked to specific action points.

Suggestions:

Condense the conclusion to avoid repetition.

Suggest clear action points for educators, policymakers, or dental practitioners.

References (Lines 184–199)

The references include relevant sources but should follow a consistent citation style.

Some references (e.g., Line 186, Line 190) do not include full journal names, which affects readability.

Suggestions:

Ensure all references follow a uniform citation format.

Expand journal abbreviations for clarity.