

Dear authors,

Your manuscript has been reviewed, but prior acceptance there are some revisions that were suggested by the reviewers.

Reviewer's comments:

Reviewer 1:

The article entitled "Analysis of Endodontic Treatment and Demographic Data in an Urban Brazilian Population: A 19-Year Single-Center Retrospective Study" provides valuable information about the distribution of endodontic procedures performed by an endodontic specialist in an urban Brazilian population. The article is well-written, the tables and figures are applicable, and I recommend it for publication.

However, I have some suggestions to improve the manuscript:

1. The last two paragraphs of the Introduction section present redundant information. I suggest combining them into a single paragraph clearly stating the aim of the present study.
2. I suggest including the information about Belo Horizonte (BH) in the Discussion section, not in the Materials and Methods section.
3. 3. Regarding the study sample: Do the authors have the total number of endodontic procedures performed during the 19-years period? If so, please include information and specify the number of excluded cases.
4. Please, review the statement at the end of the third paragraph of the Results section: "Separated instrument removal was MORE frequent in the premolar and incisor teeth (34.03% and 34.45%) than post-removal procedures (36.38% and 33.68%)." The percentages for post-removal procedures appear higher than those for separated instrument removal. Please revise this sentence for clarity and accuracy.

Overall, this is a relevant and well-organized study. I believe that addressing the points above will further strengthen the manuscript.

Reviewer 2:

Summary

In terms of results regarding endodontic treatment and retreatment were mentioned. However, the authors obtained relevant secondary outcomes, and I suggest that these be described in the abstract. In terms of methodology, what statistical tests were used? I suggest mentioning them.

Introduction

A well-founded and contextualized introduction. The references are recent. I suggest rewriting the last paragraph (secondary objectives).

Materials and Methods

For a better understanding of the methodology, I suggest drawing up a flowchart for the study design.

How were the data obtained? Were treatments performed in private practices, public health facilities, or teaching hospitals?

Results

The results were well described, according to the figures and table.

Discussion

The discussion included the interpretation and explanation of the results obtained from comparison with other studies in the same area.

The authors emphasized the advantages and limitations of the study, as well as the need for future studies to compare with other populations with different sociodemographic characteristics.

Conclusion

It responded well to the purpose of the study.

References / Figures

The study references are recent, which collaborates with the findings of the present study. The figures are very clear and notably enriched the qualitative descriptive analysis of the study.