

Subject: [BDS] Editor Decision

Dear Beatriz Cristina de Paulo, Leandro César da Silva Simões, Tatiana Cursino Pereira, Diana Pereira Cunha, Guilherme de Siqueira Ferreira Anzaloni Saavedra:

Your submission Digital planning and static guided surgery in a limited prosthetic space: a clinical case report to Brazilian Dental Science, has been revised and according to reviewers' comments, there are questions to be addressed and/or points to be clarified/corrected.

Please answer the reviewers considerations point-by-point in a separate document and also please make all the corrections in the text highlighted in yellow.

Deadline: 30 days

Thank you for considering Brazilian Dental Science for publishing your research. We are looking forward the revised version of you manuscript.

Sincerely,

Please check the attached file.

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

Questionnaire

Does the manuscript contain new and significant information to justify publication?*

Yes

Does the Abstract (Summary) clearly and accurately describe the content of the article?

Yes

Is the problem significant and concisely stated?

Yes

Are the methods or research design described comprehensively? Is the statistical analysis adequate?

Not Applicable

Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the results?

Yes

Is adequate reference made to other work in the field?

Yes

Is the language acceptable?

Yes

Manuscript Structure

Length of article is:*

Adequate

Number of tables is:

Adequate

Number of figures is:

Adequate

Please state any conflict(s) of interest that you have in relation to the review of this paper (state “none” if this is not applicable).

none.

Rating

Interest*

Good

Quality

Good

Originality

Average

Overall

Good

Recommendation

Minor Revision

Comments

Comments to the Author

The manuscript is a single case report, which inherently limits scientific impact.

Consider strengthening the discussion by:

- Comparing with quantitative accuracy data from guided vs freehand surgery;
- Including prosthodontic implications (occlusion, load distribution, emergence profile);
- The manuscript is heavily surgical/digital but lacks prosthodontic depth.

As a suggestion adding:

- Rationale for crown design and occlusal scheme;
- Discussion on load distribution in short implants;
- Consideration of crown-to-implant ratio;
- Outcome Measures;
- Clinical success is described qualitatively.

Also consider adding:

- Radiographic follow-up (bone levels if available);
- Soft tissue evaluation;
- Functional parameters (occlusion, patient-reported outcomes).

Besides that

1. Introduction

Strong overall, but:

- Slight redundancy in explaining digital workflow advantages;
- could be shortened;

2. Case Report

Excellent workflow description.

As a suggestion:

- Clarify why 12 months healing was chosen (clinical rationale);
- Specify if flapless or flapped approach was used;
- Add prosthetic space measurement or limitation description (this is central to the title).

3. Figures

Good quality overall

As a suggestion:

- Figure legends could be more descriptive and standardized; and consider adding:
- Pre-operative CBCT slice with measurements if you have ;
- Final occlusal view.

4. Discussion

- Well supported ;
- Reduce repetition about “predictability”;

As a suggestion add Accuracy deviations (mm/°) from literature and limitations of guided surgery (cost, learning curve, deviations).

5. References

Good and updated.

Add 1–2 high-impact prosthodontic references (JPD, COIR, etc.)

Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Decline Submission

Questionnaire

Does the manuscript contain new and significant information to justify publication?*

No

Does the Abstract (Summary) clearly and accurately describe the content of the article?

Yes

Is the problem significant and concisely stated?

Yes

Are the methods or research design described comprehensively? Is the statistical analysis adequate?

Not Applicable

Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the results?

Yes

Is adequate reference made to other work in the field?

Yes

Is the language acceptable?

Yes

Manuscript Structure

Length of article is:*

Adequate

Number of tables is:

Too Short

Number of figures is:

Adequate

Please state any conflict(s) of interest that you have in relation to the review of this paper (state “none” if this is not applicable).

none

Rating

Interest*

Below Average

Quality

Below Average

Originality

Below Average

Overall

Average

Recommendation

Reject

Comments

Comments to the Author

Thank you for submitting your case, I would like to greet your team for the case and approach. Most current concept on ridge preservation includes bone graft in the socket, and it was not the treatment of choice. 8.5 mm implant length is no longer consider a short implant. Picture 2, shows lack of keratinized soft tissue, does any soft tissue graft was considered?

Once again, thank you for your submission, and congratulation for your results.

Brazilian Dental Science