Brazilian Dental Science

Subject: [BDS] Editor Decision

Dear Mariana Fernanda Souza, Juliana de Freitas Gouveia Silva, Carolina Gonzales França, Lais Carolina Landim, Tarcisio José de Arruda Paes Jr:

Your submission Influence of a New Light-Curing System with Optical Fiber on the Cementation of 3D-Printed Intraradicular Posts 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,

Reviewer C:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

Questionnaire

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

Yes

Brazilian Dental Science

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

No

Is the problem significant and concisely stated?

Yes

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

Yes

Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the results?

Yes

Is adequate reference made to other work in the field?

No

Is the language acceptable?

No

Manuscript Structure

Length of article is:*

Adequate

Number of tables is:

Adequate

Brazilian Dental Science

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

Excellet

Originality

Excellent

Overall

Good

Recommendation

Minor Revision

Would you be willing to review a revision of this manuscript?

Yes

Comments

Comments to the Author

Brazilian Dental Science

Reviewer Report

After careful evaluation of the manuscript , the study is well designed and scientifically sound. However, several minor corrections are recommended to enhance clarity and consistency:

1. Abstract

The statement:

“no significant differences among experimental groups and across root thirds” should be revised, as the results clearly show significant differences among root thirds.

2. Introduction Enhancement

The introduction would benefit from a clearer statement of the research gap. To strengthen the introduction, the following type of references can be integrated:

Imran Ruaa, E.; Faris Rawaa, A.. The Utility of SHBG Assay in Clinical Biochemistry for Iraqi Women. , 2024. https://doi.org/10.25303/1907rjbt035039

Allayla, A.M.T.; Faris, R.A.; Mahdi, Z.F.. Construction of insulin-like growth factor nanocomposite biosensor by Raman spectroscopy. , 2021. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vibspec.2021.103252

Talib, B.S.; Hammood, M.K.; Faris, R.A.. A comparative study of conventional spectroscopic techniques versus a miniaturized lab-on-a-chip platform for captopril analysis. , 2025. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rio.2025.100915

Faris, R.A.; Mahdi, Z.F.; Kadhim Al-Tu'ma, M.M.; Al-Tu'ma, F.J.. Surface Enhanced Raman Spectroscopy Based Sensitive and Specific Detection of Vitamin D3, Glycated Hemoglobin, and Serum Lipid Profile of Breast Cancer Patients. , 2023. https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0157207

Faris, R.A.; Mahdi, Z.F.; Al-Layla, A.M.T.. Preliminary study of the insulin growth factor binding protein-3 (IGFBP3) level in Iraqi women with breast cancer. , 2021. https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0065368

3. Methods Clarification

In the photoactivation calculation section, the equation is not clearly presented.

✔ Suggested correction:

Radiant exposure (J/cm^2) = Irradiance (W/cm^2) × Time (s)

4. Results Alignment

There is some inconsistency between the text and Table 1 (Page 12), where clear differences between cervical and apical thirds are reported.

5. Figures Interpretation
Figure 3 (Page 14) requires deeper explanation in the text.
6. Discussion Strength
The discussion is good but could be strengthened by emphasizing the novelty.

7. Language Refinement
1- Some sentences in the discussion are overly long.
2- Minor grammatical polishing is recommended.
3- Reduce repetition of terms such as “light transmission” and “polymerization”.

Reviewer E:
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

Brazilian Dental Science

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

No

Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the results?

No

Is adequate reference made to other work in the field?

No

Is the language acceptable?

Yes

Manuscript Structure

Length of article is:*

Adequate

Number of tables is:

Adequate

Number of figures is:

Too Short

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

Brazilian Dental Science

Interest*

Good

Quality

Good

Originality

Good

Overall

Good

Recommendation

Major Revision

Would you be willing to review a revision of this manuscript?

Yes

Comments

Comments to the Author

Attache the recommended figures where I put comments.
