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**Reviewer's report:**

This is a timely and interesting topic. Overall, the study is well conducted and the manuscript nicely written. Only some very minor aspects should be taken into consideration when revising the manuscript.

Minor concerns are:

- Page 3, line 42: Delete “GMBH” and provide city of the manufacturer. Moreover, it would be of interest for the reader to have some more detailed information about the composition and the concentration of the ingredients of Desy Clean. Please provide.

- Page 4, line 55: Single-rooted teeth were selected. I assume only teeth with straight roots and root canals were included. Please provide information regarding canal curvature and add the method how this was assessed (e.g. “Teeth with curvature of less than 5° according to the method described by Schneider”).

- Page 6, lines 111 and 115: It is more accurate to say “root canal treatment” instead of “endodontic treatment” and to use “root canal-treated teeth” instead of “endodontically treated teeth”.

- Page 7, line 138: the use of personal pronouns should be avoided.

- Page 7, line 139: reference must be given as in my version an error with the reference number occurred

- Table 1: statistical differences could be included in this table (e.g. using superscript letters)

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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