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Reviewer's report:

In the PDF file, there are three drafts for the same study!

I considered the first one as the revised final draft and reviewed it.

The number of variables and the reached conclusions are relatively big without power analyses justify this small sample size (only 10 in every subgroup).

References are needed in the following sentences;

1- page 4 line 53-56

2- page 5 line 31-36 for every type of dental material.

3- page 5 line 41-44 considering it gold standard and the ideal filling needs scientific evidence.

4- page 6 line 28-31

5- page 12 line 21

6- page 13 line 22-30 claiming that dye extraction is reliable need scientific evidence.

7- page 13 line 32 - 33

8- page 14 line 32-34

9- page 14 line 40 link the name of the studies with the references.

Page 5 line 15: considering apicoectomy as a conservative form of treatment is very controversial because it contains surgical intervention.

Page 9 line 38-50 there is no need to repeat the complete content of the table in the text.

Page 16 line 8-13 the sentence need rephrasing to be clearer and reflect the study results.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
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