

# Review of: "Comparative Study Between the Efficacy of 4% Articaine Infiltration and 2% Lidocaine Nerve Block as Local Anesthetic Agents for Painful Dental Procedures in Children Aged 6-18 Years"

Camila Candido<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universidade Estadual de Campinas

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear authors:

It is a study aimed at comparing the anesthetic efficacy of 4% articaine as buccal infiltration with 2% lidocaine as a nerve block to contribute to a more profound knowledge about the quality of articaine as a local anesthetic agent.

Based on my assessment, several points could be further explored. Here are my comments:

A reference is needed for the sentence in the introduction: "Recent evidence showed that buccal infiltration with articaine produced palatal and lingual anesthesia, thus eliminating the need for block anesthesia and multiple injections, which were uncomfortable and painful for children."

The sentence "Despite its popularity, articaine was not routinely used as an anesthetic agent by clinicians in their practice." could be completed with "in children," given that this study focuses on this demographic, and there are several publications regarding the routine use of articaine.

There are significant limitations in the methodology, and these should be further elaborated upon in the paper. Details about each of the groups, which nerves were blocked in each session, how many children participated in each of the procedures, and the Clinical Trials Registry should be included.