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Reviewer's report:

The article has a relevant and a general issue is well structured and written.

However, because it is a systematic review, one of the basic principles required is that the search strategy is comprehensive to include all relevant articles about it.

The authors conducted the search with just three words "core carrier OR Thermafil AND obturation", that makes many studies may have been excluded in view of the number of synonyms that could have been used.

I suggest therefore that the search strategy is remade to improve the quality of the study. Moreover, the conclusion of the article compares core-carrier obturation with cold side condensantion, this conclusion does not answer the question posed in the aim. The objective does not intend to compare the two techniques, I suggest that this be reviewed and included if necessary.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

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

No

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

No

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript
Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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