
Scientific Reports: Decision on your manuscript

3 pesan

Scientific Reports <srep@nature.com>
Kepada: dian-agustin-w@fkg.unair.ac.id

2 November 2020 12.43

Ref: Submission ID bb8820d7-2369-4cc8-a634-2517b22c3a52

Dear Dr Wahjuningrum,

Re: "Apical debris extrusion of during instrumentation of oval root canals in primary teeth using manual versus mechanized files: An ex vivo study. "

We are pleased to let you know that your manuscript has now passed through the review stage and is ready for revision. Many manuscripts require a round of revisions, so this is a normal but important stage of the editorial process.

Editorial Board Member comments

Having intensively reviewed your draft, your submitted draft has been rated controversially by our reviewers, and one referee has additionally indicated that a version highlighting all changes would seem missing. Please note that I have double checked your submitted draft (R #1). To finalize your paper convincingly, and to meet both SCIENTIFIC REPORTS' quality standards and our readership's expectations, please stick to ALL reviewers' comments. Remember that a non-convincing revision (not considered acceptable with regard to language, reviewers' constructive criticism, content, generalizable outcome, and/or Authors' Guidelines) will lead to outright reject.

To ensure the Editor and Reviewers will be able to recommend that your revised manuscript is accepted, please pay careful attention to each of the comments that have been pasted underneath this email. This way we can avoid future rounds of clarifications and revisions, moving swiftly to a decision.

Once you have addressed each comment and completed each step listed below, please upload your revised submission along with the final file here:

<https://submission.nature.com/submit-revision/bb8820d7-2369-4cc8-a634-2517b22c3a52>

CHECKLIST FOR SUBMITTING YOUR REVISION

1. Please upload a point-by-point response to the comments, including a description of any additional experiments that were carried out and a detailed rebuttal of any criticisms or requested revisions that you disagreed with. This must be uploaded as a 'Point-by-point response to reviewers' file.

You'll find a handy one-page PDF on how to respond to reviewers' comments here:

https://www.nature.com/documents/Effective_Response_To_Reviewers-1.pdf

2. Please highlight all the amends on your manuscript or indicate them by using tracked changes.

3. Check the format for revised manuscripts in our submission guidelines, making sure you pay particular attention to the figure resolution requirements:

<https://www.nature.com/srep/publish/guidelines>

Finally, if you have been asked to improve the language or presentation of your manuscript and would like the assistance of paid editing services, we can recommend our affiliates, Nature Research Editing Service:

<https://authorservices.springernature.com/language-editing> and American Journal Experts: <https://www.aje.com/go/springernature>

Please note that use of an editing service is neither a requirement nor a guarantee of publication. Free assistance is available from our resources page: <https://www.springernature.com/gp/researchers/campaigns/english-language-forauthors>

To support the continuity of the peer review process, we recommend returning your manuscript to us within 28 days. If you think you will need additional time, please let us know and we will aim to respond within 48 hours.

Kind regards,

Andrej Kielbassa
Editorial Board Member
Scientific Reports

Reviewer Comments:

Reviewer 1

Abstract

- What is a "mechanized file"?

- "Within the limitations of the present study, it may be concluded that the motorized files extruded less debris and required less time compared to traditional K-files." This is a simple repetition of your results. Please provide a reasonable extension of your outcome.

Intro

- "37°C" must read "37 °C". The unit is °C, please separate numbers and units. Revise thoroughly throughout your text.

Methods

- "The working length (WL) was established as 1 mm short of the apex." Please provide reasons. Primary teeth often reveal resorptions, and calculating WL at -1 would not seem adequate.

- You might wish to go to <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/12539034/>, and revise/discuss this aspect.

- "(Sartorius Intec; Hamburg, Germany)": What does Sartorius Intec refer to? Information unclear, please add manufacturer.

- "(Coltene/Whaledent, Langenau, Germany)" must read "(Coltène/Whaledent, Langenau, Germany)".

- Please stick to uniform writing/formatting, see "millimeters" vs. "mm", or "37oC" vs. "70°C"

- What does "mL" refer to? Should read "ml"?

- "Newton-centimetre"?

- "(SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA)"? SPSS is the program, not the manufacturer. Again, do not use "Inc.".

Results

- Again, please revise for uniform formatting. "The mean weights were 2.13 (± 0.46) mg (...)" should read "The mean weights (±SD) were 2.13 (±0.46) mg (...)". Compare "2.13 (± 0.46) mg" vs. "7.33 ± 1.2 minutes", and revise thoroughly.

- Compare "min" and "minutes". Please note that there still are numerous shortcomings, and this would seem astonishing with a revised draft.

Disc

- "(...) with an oval cross-section [5]." What about formatting your reference numbers uniformly?

- What about your second H0?

- "Within the limitations of the present study, it may be concluded that the motorized files extruded less debris and required less time compared to traditional K-files." Please see comments given above. Please provide a reasonable extension of your outcome, instead of simply repeating your results.

Refs

- What about the respective doi numbers?

- Again, please revise for uniform formatting. See, for example:

"22. Esentürk, G., et al. A micro-computed tomographic assessment of root canal preparation with conventional and different rotary files in primary teeth and young permanent teeth. *Int. J. Paediatr. Dent.* 30, 202-208 (2019)."

- Revise for typos, see "micro□computed tomography".

Again, insulting some recently pub,shed papers would seem helpful. This revised and re-submitted is not considered ready to proceed.

Reviewer 3

Dear Editor/ authors,

I would like to thank you for the opportunity of the present revision. The authors properly addressed the main suggestions. This study will certainly contribute to the body of knowledge regarding the endodontic treatment of primary teeth.

Summary:

The recommendation: Accept.

Reviewer 2

Please provide the manuscript file highlighting the suggested changes done after first revision.

****Our flexible approach during the COVID-19 pandemic****

If you need more time at any stage of the peer-review process, please do let us know. While our systems will continue to remind you of the original timelines, we aim to be as flexible as possible during the current pandemic.

agustin wahjuningrum Dian <dian-agustin-w@fkg.unair.ac.id>
Kepada: Anuj Bhardwaj <dranuj_84@yahoo.co.in>

2 November 2020 14.20

[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]

agustin wahjuningrum Dian <dian-agustin-w@fkg.unair.ac.id>
Kepada: ferysetiawanjprime@gmail.com

3 Agustus 2021 19.48

----- Forwarded message -----

Dari: **Scientific Reports** <srep@nature.com>

Date: Sen, 2 Nov 2020 pukul 12.43

Subject: Scientific Reports: Decision on your manuscript

To: <dian-agustin-w@fkg.unair.ac.id>

[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]