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Reviewer's report:

Dear authors

Congratulations for your work. It's a very interesting study with great contribution for the literature.

I have just some questions about the methods and therefore, the conclusion.

The major concern is regarding the keywords used for database search. Actually, you used just one expression for searching the articles. I think you should pick more keywords, in order to obtain a larger amount of articles.

In your introduction, you stated about just two methods of root canal filling (core carrier and lateral condensation). Don't you think you should compare the success rate of core-carrier obturation technique with all order techniques?

In table 1, you classified the risk of bias of each reference. Based on this, don't you think you should exclude articles with any high risk of bias or articles with "unclear risk" in more than half of the items? How reliable were those articles to be part of the selected ones?

In your conclusion, you stated that a 83% of success rate and 33% of overfilling is acceptable. Do you really think that's clinically acceptable? How is the success rate of other techniques?

Again, congratulations for your hard work. Please consider my comments in order to improve your article.

Best regards
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
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