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In this Systematic review the authors evaluated fracture resistance values and failure mode of weakened roots restored with cast post and core, fiber post and anatomical posts.

The article lacks much additional information.

**The authors are grateful for your contributions and considerations about this paper, they certainly were taken in account and the necessary changes were made on the main text.**

Abstract

1) Provide data sources; study eligibility criteria, study appraisal and synthesis methods; results; limitations and systematic review registration number.

**Authors: Thanks for your consideration, all changes were made on the abstract.**

Introduction

2) The author did not justify why in vitro studies were used in the review.

**Response: Thanks for your considerations, the authors decided to review in vitro studies based on the lack of clinical trials regarding this subject. The appropriate changes were made on the main text**

3) All systematic reviews have a KEY QUESTION, but this work does not. Nowhere in the text the key question is mentioned. The absence of the key question certainly impacted the data search.

**Response: Thanks for your consideration, the review Key question was added on the text.**

4) Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design.

**Response: The authors altered the main text to clearly identify the PICO question**

Material and Methods

5) How did the authors follow the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions if it does not allow systematic reviews made with in vitro studies?

**Authors: The text was modified, this systematic review was based on Cochrane Handbook.**

6) Why did not the authors present the work registration protocol? Indicate if a review protocol exists, if and where it can be accessed (e.g., Web address), and, if available, provide registration information including registration number.

**Authors: The registration protocol on PROSPERO, cannot be done for systematic review of in vitro studies. We understand that this is a limitation of the study.**

7) MEDLINE / Pubmed and Scopus are few databases to be consulted for a systematic review. A systematic review should be as comprehensive as possible, so I suggest that the authors also search in EMBASE, BIREME, SciELO, LILACS and Web of Science. Few databases can generate a significant risk of selection bias in the review.

**Authors: Thanks for your consideration, the authors understand that the number of databases used may be low, so this was added on the discussion as a study limitation. However, Pubmed and scopus are two of the world's leading databases, containing the vast majority of indexed dental journals. So, considering that the paper issues is poorly explored on the literature, these databases may provide an adequate number of references for a systematic review.**

8) Gray literature should also be consulted. Describe the strategies of this data search.

**Authors: As we can observe from the PRISMA flow diagram, less than 1% of articles were deemed eligible and included in the study and for this reason we believe that that very few additional relevant reports would be identified for the additional effort and because that we did not search in grey literature.**

9) Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence (e.g., publication bias, selective reporting within studies).

**Authors: We did not perform the assessment of publication bias or other type of evaluation because we have only six studies included in the systematic review making this type of assessment impossible.**

10) The search strategy should always be based on the key question, but it was not in this systematic review.

**Authors: The authors are grateful for the consideration. The search strategy was based on the key question that was add on the main text.**

11) The literature search was made by two independently reviewers. Data concerning the calibration analysis were not mentioned.

**Authors: The search was based on the inclusion/exclusion criteria and the PICOT, although no calibration analysis were made. The authors understand that a calibration analysis is an important issue, but it is not mandatory on a systematic review.**

12) The authors did not justify why they used random effect models to calculate the pooled mean diferences.

**Authors: Thank for your comment. We used the random effect model because we understand that the included studies do not share a common effect size and they present between-studies variance. A sentence was added in the statistical analysis section.**

**Results**

13) The authors showed diferences in Cementation material used, Wakening length and thickness, Specimens aging, Ferrule effect and Relining material. The data come from very different studies. Authors should discuss the impact of these differences on the outcomes of the study.

**Authors: Thanks for your suggestion, the impact of the differences on the variables were added on the discussion section.**

14) Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias).

**Author: These limitations were discussed on the discussion section**

15) Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research.

**Authors: A paragraph was added on the discussion section. Thanks for your suggestion.**

16) Since the data are so heterogeneous, why did not the authors perform some subgroup analysis? I suggest that based on the above-mentioned variations (Cementation material used, Wakening length and thickness, Specimens aging, Ferrule effect and Relining material), this type of analysis should be performed to minimize heterogeneity.

**Authors: We agree that subgroup analysis is important to minimize heterogeneity. However, we have only six studies included, and a subgroup analysis would result in 2 studies by factor making difficult the interpretation of results.**

17) In the last paragraph, it should be mentioned that 2 criteria present unclear risk.

**Authors: Thanks, the changes were made on the main text**

Discussion

18) The authors mention that it is difficult to identify the causes of the heterogeneity of the study, but the authors answer this question in the material and methods. I suggest to deepen the discussion about the impacts of heterogeneity in the review analyzes. With the subgroup analysis, discuss the impact observed in the heterogeneity paterns.

**Authors: Thanks for your suggestion, the necessary text changes were made.**