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Author’s response to reviews:

Thank you for your comments.

Minor comments:

Comment: Methods. I suggest put the Sample size and Measurements reproducibility as separate sections of statistical analysis. Additionally, all information about sample size calculation needs to be together in the Sample size section (included the final number of teeth).

- All information about sample size calculation are now together in the Sample size section (included the final number of teeth). Sample size is in separate section, Measurements reproducibility is in a separate section. Both sections are now separate from statistical analysis.

Comment: Statistical analysis. Thank you for clarifying the point around regression analysis. However, I am still not entirely sure what was done here. How the logistic regression was performed? Did all variables enter in the model? These points need to be addressed to clarify the information for the reader. The values of OR and CI 95% should be added on the table. As I
requested in the last review, the author should remove the lines among the variables and the lateral lines. Also, I suggest put the test used in footnotes.

- Regression analysis was performed including only one predictor variable (age) for all dependent variables (total success, clinic and radiographic success outcome). Sex was not included as it does not affect the pulpotomy success.

The values of OR an CI 95% are now in the table.

The table has a new format: lines among variables and lateral lines were removed.

The test is now in the footnotes.

If the authors can clarify these points, I have no further comments on the manuscript. Well done in particular for constructively addressing the relevance and implications of the study.