



Letter to “Evaluation of the efficiency of fluoride-releasing adhesives for preventing secondary caries in vitro: a systematic review and meta-analysis”

C. Lu¹ · M. Liu¹

Received: 24 February 2019 / Accepted: 10 June 2019 / Published online: 15 June 2019
© European Academy of Paediatric Dentistry 2019

Recently, the work (Martins et al. 2018) “*Evaluation of the efficiency of fluoride-releasing adhesives for preventing secondary caries in vitro: a systematic review and meta-analysis*” was published in *European Archives of Paediatric Dentistry*, which examined the efficiency of fluoride-releasing adhesives for preventing secondary caries in vitro. But here we had a question on section of search strategy in this work. The authors reported that three electronic databases were searched, but their report on search strategy may be a mistake. We know that different databases have different index approaches, and there only PubMed database have this search format—“[MeSH Terms]” and “[Title/Abstract]”. However, the authors did not mention that this was a search strategy of PubMed. Therefore, this is not in compliance with (Moher et al. 2009) PRISMA guideline and may confuse new beginners.

Compliance with ethical standards

Conflict of interest None.

References

- Martins FV, Vasques WF, Fonseca EM. Evaluation of the efficiency of fluoride-releasing adhesives for preventing secondary caries in vitro: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur Arch Paediatr Dent*. 2018;20:1–8.
- Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *BMJ*. 2009;339:b2535.

Publisher’s Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

✉ C. Lu
cuncunlu2017@126.com

¹ School of Basic Medical Sciences, Lanzhou University, Lanzhou, China