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Author’s response to reviews:

Comment 1: Introduction is still extensive, and the aims of the present study should be clearly and objectively, with more consistent information.
Reply: As suggested by the reviewer we revised the introduction more detailed in the Introduction section, line 9- line 17, page 4. The aims of the present study has revised in Discussion section, line 2- line 5, page 8.

Comment 2: The methodological should be better explored regarding to the sample selection as mentioned in the first review "Mandibular premolars were selected for this study. I believe the choice must have been based on the concentration of occlusal and masticatory forces this tooth undergoes and bears when in function. Thus, such information should be highlighted in the text, especially in the discussion.
Reply: Thank you for your suggestion, we’ve described why choose premolars as specimen in the Discussion section, line 21- line 26, page 8.

Comment 3: The literature demonstrates that the mandibular premolars are one of the dental groups that most present anatomical variations in the amount and shape of the root canal system, as well as in the external root surface. Thus, 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 relation to the number and morphological pattern of the root canal system? What was the Vertucci's classification selected?" I still strongly suggest that the evaluation of the sample selection was done by computerized microcomputed tomography.
Reply: Thank you for your suggestion, we’ve addressed the method of classification more detailed in the Methods section, Selection of teeth, line 9- line 17, page 4.
Comment 4: In my opinion the results are still very confusingly and make it difficult for readers to understand. I suggest that the authors try to be more objective, and describe in the text only the most interesting results. In addition, as requested, there is no qualitative analysis of the three-dimensional models of the root canal as a whole and not by root thirds.
Reply: As suggested by the reviewer we revised the Results more clearly and interesting. we discussioned the qualitative analysis of the three-dimensional models of the root canal in the Discussion section, line 12- line 14, page 9.

Comment 5: The discussion is very superficial. The authors do not discuss the results presented according to what has already been established in the literature.
Reply: Thank you for your suggestion, we deeper discussed the results in the Discussion section.

Comment 6: I suggest that grammar proofing be done since the text has some typos, as well as the language review certified by a native speaker. Also, the manuscript should be inserted in the journal guidelines required by the BMC Oral Health as well as updating the references.
Reply: Thank you for your suggestion, we revised the manuscript by a native speaker. We have inserted references of BMC Oral Health and updated the references.