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**Reviewer's report:**

The authors made significant changes that improved the article. Almost all of my concerns were responded in this revision version. However, there are still concerns about the methods and discussion. Further insights into the text should be provided for better understanding as following.

Substantial comments:

Comment: Introduction page 3, lines17-24. What are the references for pulpotomy indications? The irreversible pulpitis must not indicate in primary dentition. The authors should modify these sentences.

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".

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

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.

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?
Minor comments:

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.

Comment: Replace "patients" for participants.

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

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.

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

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

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.
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