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Author’s response to reviews:

Reviewer #1

Comment 1: The title needs to be revised and shortened.
Reply: As suggested by the reviewer we revised the title “Impacts of contracted endodontic cavities compare to traditional endodontic cavities in premolars”

Comment 2: The authors should provide more detailed information in particular for the result section, the abstract should provide enough information for the reader to understand what was done in the research as well as the main findings.
Reply: As suggested by the reviewer, we provided more detailed information in the result section and abstract section.

Comment 3: The authors should make it clear the main objective of the study as well as the secondary objectives.
Reply: We apologize for the mistake, we addressed this issue in the Discussion section, page 9, line 1-12.

Comment 4: Please review the citations in the M & M section for all the companies.
Reply: We thank the reviewer for pointing out this mistake. We carefully revised the citation for all the companies.
Comment 5: The number of figures should be reduced.
Reply: As suggested by the reviewer, we merged figure 1 and figure 2.

Comment 6: The conclusion should be reviewed according to the aims of the study
Reply: Thank you for your suggestion, we’ve addressed it in the conclusion section, line 8- line 10, page 12.

Comment 7: English needs to be revised by a native speaker.
Reply: We apologize for poor English writing. We revised the manuscript by a native speaker.

Reviewer #2
Comment 1: The scientific literature is not clear about the characteristics, differences, advantages and disadvantages between the biomechanical preparation and filling of root canal by means traditional and conservative endodontic cavities, so in this reason this study is necessary. Thus, the authors should direct the introduction only to the aims of the present study, clearly and objectively, with more consistent information.
Reply: We addressed the reviewer’s concern in the Background section page 3, line 15-18 and page 4, line 5-14, conclusion section page 13, line 8-10, discussion section, page 10, line 21-24.

Comment 2: Some methodological aspects deserve highlighting and clarification. Mandibular premolars were selected for this study; careful selection of the sample prior to the development of the study must have been performed. Thus, the authors should clarify how the sample was selected in. I believe the choice must have been based on the concentration of occlusal and masticatory forces this tooth undergoes and bears when in function.
Reply: We thank reviewer for this important suggestion. We addressed this in the background section, page 4, line 5-14.