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In response to Reviewer # 1 (Jose C de la Macorra)

General

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Materials and Methods
The new/added paragraph (In group n(II) with a size [...]not clear.) remains obscure.
* This question addressed by the reviewer was answered in the previous revision.
Results section is now difficult to understand. Author has excluded data, that were repeated in a table, but gives no information in text of the reason of placing the table.
Table 3 needs further data and explaining. What test was used, what results were obtained in it
* I re-write the result section to be more understandable giving the reason for placing the tables, T test was the test used to do all the comparisons as mentioned in the materials and methods section.

Discussion
This part still needs to make clear that the difference in number of radiographs between groups comes from the methodology selected, not by the technique itself
* I deleted the part comparing the two methods with regard to the total number of radiographs from the previous revision. Nevertheless, I kept the data of the total number of radiographs in the two groups because it has an indication of the effect of adjunctive use of apex locator on reducing the total number of radiographs and the frequency of retakes. (The results of the present study also showed that electronic predetermination of working length prior to working length radiograph resulted in a total number of a mean of approximately three radiographs including pre-operative and post-operative radiographs which means that approximately a zero retake was needed.)

Reviewer # 2 (Ashraf Fouad)
Reviewer's report:
The authors have adequately addressed my previous concerns. I recommend publishing the manuscript

What next?: Accept without revision
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