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**Reviewer's report:**

Dear authors,

This review suffers from some shortcomings that need to be addressed before publication.

Comments:

Abstract:

The Abstract should not exceed 350 words.

Please, complete the aim of the study.

Aim: The aim of this study was to conduct a systematic review in order to compare different pulpotomy dressing agents for pulpotomy treatment in immature permanent teeth.

Provide a structured summary including: background; objectives; data sources; study eligibility criteria, participants, and interventions; study appraisal and synthesis methods; results; limitations; conclusions and implications of key findings; systematic review registration number.

Methods:

- Protocol and registration: provide registration information including registration number.
- Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.

Results

Agreement between the two reviewers in the study selection was good. The calibration process is not clear in the methods.

Discussion

The Discussion-section seems unfocused. Please, re-write this section considering the main aim of the study, description of principal findings, Strengths and weaknesses of the study, unanswered questions and future researches.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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