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Reviewer's comments:

Luciana Oliveira (Reviewer 1): Dear authors, The paper presents findings from a systematic review which was undertaken to assess the success rate of pulpotomy in immature permanent teeth with carious or traumatic exposed pulp, focusing on the difference between different dressing agents. However, there are a number of limitations which need addressing to improve the quality of the paper. Methods: The aim of the study in terms of the PICO needs to be clearly stated in this section. A summary of the search strategy employed should be presented in this section. Thanks for the opportunity to see this work.

Response: We thank the reviewer for this suggestion. We have added the purpose of the study in terms of the PICO: Our focused question was based on the Participants, Interventions, Control and Outcomes (PICO) principle: ‘For immature permanent teeth receiving pulpotomy, which medicament was the best choice?’ And a summary of the search strategy was also presented in this section: The following search strategy was adapted for each database search: (pulpotomy OR pulpotomies OR pulp therapy OR pulp treatment OR pulp exposure) AND (permanent OR adult OR secondary) AND (random*), limited in ‘English’. (‘Materials and methods’ section, page 3 line 42, page 3 line 50)
Sary Borzangy, BDS, MSD, DMSc, Pros Cert., Imp Cert. FHEA (Reviewer 2): Thank you for improving your manuscript so nicely and positively. The manuscript has been improved and i think the manuscript should be accepted.

Response: We thank the reviewer for this suggestion.