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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

We would like to thank the reviewers for their comments that helps to improve the final version of the manuscript. We have provided the following letter giving a point-by-point response to their concerns.

“OHEA-D-16-00494R1
Clinical and radiographic evaluation of Biodentine versus Calcium hydroxide in primary teeth pulpotomies: a retrospective study
Silvia Caruso; Teresa Dinoi; Giuseppe Marzo; Vincenzo Campanella; Maria Rita Giuca; Roberto Gatto; Marco Pasini
BMC Oral Health”
“Comment: Introduction page 3, lines 17-24. What are the references for pulpotomy indications? The irreversible pulpitis must not indicate in primary dentition. The authors should modify these sentences”.

References pulpotomy indications were included and “irreversible pulpitis” was removed from the sentence.

Comment: Patient records page 5, line 47 onwards. The authors have been described the paper as a retrospective study. However, a random process was mentioned in participant's selection. The selection was not clear. Why do not use the 450 available patient records? What means a random analysis? The text refers to "random computerized analysis " which I'm assuming should be "random computerized selection".

The sentence was modified and random analysis was removed as it was performed a selection of the patients that meet the inclusion criteria. The 450 available patients records were not all eligible patients for this study.

Comment: Statistical analysis. How was calculated OR? It was used a regression model?

Statistical analysis: a logistic regression analysis was used. The sentence was modified in the text.

Comment: Discussion. The relevance and implication of this study are not clear to me. Why is important to study the use of Biodentine in pulpotomy? What this study add to clinic practice and scientific knowledge? The paper needs to be modified in these terms, and the interpretation of the findings seen discussed more fully.

Discussion: the relevance and implication of this study were discussed more fully. It was written the importance of studying biodentine medications in pulpotomies. It was added what the study add to clinic practice and scientific knowledge.

Comment: Conclusions page 12, line 36 onwards. The conclusion is not a conclusion; it is merely a restating of the main finding. What do you conclude from your study about comparison between biodentine and calcium hydroxide?
Conclusions: page 12: restating of the main findings were removed and a new conclusion paragraph was written.

Comment: Introduction. Are there studies comparing Biodentine with another material? Please, add this information in the introduction.

The authors have been explored more MTA studies, but the focus needs to be in the materials used in this paper.

Studies focusing on biondentine were included in the introduction.

Comment: Replace "patients" for participants.

The term “patient” was modified in the whole manuscript.

Comment: Patient records page 5, line 45 onwards. Be careful not to conflate Methods and Results.

Patients records: results were removed from this section in order not to conflate methods and results (from line 45 onwards as indicated by the reviewer).

Comment: Statistical analysis page 7, lines 40-47. The calibration process includes intra and inter-examiner reproducibility. This paragraph should be rewrite to make clear the information for reader.

I suggest write the measurement reproducibility in a separate section.

Statistical analysis: the sentence was changed and measurements reproducibility was written in a separate section.

Comment: Results page 8, line 36. I suggest remove "(CH and biodentine)".

Results, Page 8, line 36: “CH and biodentine” was removed

Comment: Discussion page 9, lines 27-31. In the first paragraph, the authors should write the mainly findings.
Discussion: we wrote the mainly findings in the first paragraph.

Comment: Table 1. The table should be modified because it is not a table. Please, remove the lines among the variables and the lateral lines. Also, I suggest put the test used in footnotes.

Table 1: the table was modified as suggested. The lines among variables and lateral lines were removed and the test used was put in the footnotes.