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Reviewer's report:

Dear authors

Thank you very much for revising the manuscript and addressing all the points I raised in the first evaluation.

I have two additional suggestions on the text included in this updated version. I also ask attention for tables formatting (all tables in the manuscript).

Background, 1st paragraph:

This variation can be attributed to the different methods that were used by the researchers: study protocols (in vivo or in vitro); sample size; and techniques used to identify canal configuration. (3, 6, 7) This variation could also be associated with age, sex, and ethnic differences of the study populations. (8)

Methods, 2nd paragraph

The inclusion criteria were to have at least one 1st or 2nd upper molar with fully-developed apices. Teeth showing root resorption, root canal treatment, post or other crown reconstruction that would make difficult to assess their anatomy were excluded. Of the 300 CBCT scans examined, 112 fulfilled the above criteria.

Tables 1 to 6

Please do not use vertical lines, and maintain the horizontal lines just as in the attached example.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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