

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-53537

Date: 28-08-2025

Title: Comparative Evaluation of Fracture Resistance of Endodontically Treated Mandibular Molars Restored with Direct Conventional Composite Versus Composite Restoration Reinforced with Horizontal Fiberglass Posts: An In?Vitro Study

Recommendation:

Accept as it isYES.....

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 Aamina**

Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

General Overview:

The introduction addresses a relevant and clinically significant issue in restorative dentistry—fracture resistance of endodontically treated mandibular molars. The topic is well aligned with current trends in conservative restorative approaches and post-endodontic tooth reinforcement. The title is precise, descriptive, and effectively conveys the scope of the study.

Content Evaluation:

The introduction is clearly structured and establishes the rationale for the study. It begins by highlighting the dilemma of structural compromise following endodontic treatment and the role of fracture as a major cause of post-treatment failure. The reference to the high success rates of microbial control yet persistence of mechanical vulnerability adds strength to the contextual background.

The clinical significance of financial and logistical barriers delaying full-coverage restorations is appropriately emphasized, making the problem highly relatable to real-world practice. The

REVIEWER'S REPORT

manuscript then transitions logically to the concept of fiber reinforcement, supported with references to in-vitro findings that show benefits of horizontally oriented fiberglass posts.

The specific focus on mandibular molars is well-justified, as these teeth experience greater functional stress and are more prone to fracture. This establishes a clear research gap and provides a solid foundation for the stated aim.

Scientific Merit:

The introduction demonstrates good understanding of biomechanical challenges in endodontically treated teeth. It also identifies the importance of alternative restorative strategies when full-coverage crowns are not immediately feasible. The rationale is evidence-based, drawing on literature to support claims regarding fracture risk, restoration delays, and reinforcement techniques.

Clarity and Readability:

The writing style is clear, professional, and academically appropriate. Key ideas are logically sequenced, and citations are provided at relevant points. Terminology is consistent with scientific standards in restorative dentistry and endodontics.

Conclusion of Review:

The introduction successfully presents the clinical problem, theoretical background, research gap, and aim of the study in a concise yet comprehensive manner. The manuscript demonstrates strong contextualization and sets up the experimental design rationale effectively.
