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Reviewer's report:

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.
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
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
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

What next?: Reject because too small an advance to publish

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

Statistical review: Yes