Review of Accuracy of Artificial Intelligence-Designed Dental Crowns: A Scoping Review
Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript, which scopes the literature on AI-supported crown design.

While the topic is timely, I feel that important elements in the Methods and Results are missing or insufficiently reported.

The iThenticate similarity index is 44%, which is unacceptably high and should be reduced substantially.

Abstract: The abstract should be structured, also does not present well the main idea of the research. Methods are not presented clear. Results are not described precise.
Introduction: The AIM/Purpose of the review is not well stated. Also, research question is missing.
Material and Methods: For scoping reviews is better to use PCC (Population, Concept, Context)- framework, PICO(S) is for systematic reviews.

- Does the scoping review receive registration?
- The sentence "linked through Boolean operators" is too generic. For each database, provide the **exact, reproducible search words.**
- *In vivo* , *in vitro* should be written in italics.
- The statement: "In cases where discrepancies arose, disagreements were resolved through discussion and consensus" is **methodologically weak** and may conceal risk of Bias.
- The statement: "Data extracted from the included studies were charted in Microsoft Excel. The program was used to systematically organize study characteristics". Please clarify whether you mean **Microsoft Excel** (specify version) or another program.

Results:

- In Figure 2 – correct database names to **PubMed** and **Web of Science**
- How did you remove the duplicates? Did you use some software/tool/procedure? Can you describe more the method?
- The statement: "This upward trend may be attributed to the accelerated advancement and commercialization of AI-driven dental CAD software during this period." Is speculative and not appropriate for the results section, better add in discussion with citation.
- Line 153-154,177 other authors cannot be cited in results section.
- After all, results contains speculative trend language, inconsistent citation style, and insufficient quantitative detail for outcomes/datasets.

Discussion:

- The Discussion repeats portions of the Results; please focus on synthesis, interpretation, and implications.
- Limitations of the presented research are missing.