

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/fomm-22-68>

First External Peer Review

Reviewer A

- Comment 1: Abstract demonstrates only the clinical case details, please mention more the literature as a part of this paper

Reply 1: We have modified our text as advised

Changes in the text: See Page 1-2, line 14-15, 22-29

- Comment 2: It's not a literature review, it's a mini review

Reply 2: All relevant articles are added based on inclusion and exclusion criteria

Changes in the text:

- Comment 3: Any ethical committee?

Reply 3: Written and informed oral consent was taken from the patient. No ethical committee approval was required.

Changes in the text: -

- Comment 4: Volume of the irrigants?

Reply 4: We have added some data as advised

Changes in the text: See Page 6, line 138; Page 12, line 272; Page 14, line-314

- Comment 5: more details about the final irrigation with activation

Reply 5: We have modified our text as advised

Changes in the text: See Page 14, line-314

- Comment 6: All the articles on this subject were included in the review

Reply 6: We have added all recent articles from PubMed from 2012-2023

Changes in the text: See Page 7 line 155 and Table 1

- Comment 7: Figure 1-5 could be assembled

Reply 7: Figure 1-5 are assembled as advised

Changes in the text: -

- Comment 8: Please delete the name of the operator, and more professional image is recommended

Reply 8: Name of the operator from image is deleted

Changes in the text: -

Reviewer B

- Comment 1: The introduction should be more robust, with a greater grounding in recent literature that justifies the need for the study in question.

Reply 1: We have modified our text as advised

Changes in the text: See Page 3-4, line 45-85

- Comment 2: Studies of internal anatomy by micro ct can help.

Reply 2: We have modified our text as advised

Changes in the text: See Page 4, line 71-73

- Comment 3: The authors refer to the variation of anatomy as an aberrant root canal anatomy.

Reply 3: We have added our case classification based on Ahmed et al 2018 article in our text

Changes in the text: See Page 9, line 192-195

- Comment 4: Patient was apparently asymptomatic 1 month back when she started experiencing pain during mastication.” - How can the authors say that the patient was asymptomatic a month ago?

Reply 4: Patient gave history that she was apparently asymptomatic a month back and we have modified our text as advised

Changes in the text: See Page 4, line 90-91

- Comment 5: lower right back and upper left back teeth” - Put the appropriate name of the elements. I suggest you do not use tooth numbering since it is not standardized in all countries. What type of radiography was used? Is it periapical? Digital?

Reply 5: Tooth numbering is not used (Page 4, line 89-90)

Digital radiography was used and we have modified our text as advised (Page 5, Line 112)

Changes in the text: See Page 4, line 89-90; Page 5, Line 112

- Comment 6: The figures from 1 to 7 could be modified and an image board created with all of them being Figure 1. And each of them named with letters (such as: Figure 1 would become 1A, Figure 2 - 1B....)

Reply 6: Figures 1-5 are assembled

Changes in the text: -

- Comment 7: It is important that the authors cite in the text that they followed the Care (checklist of information to include when writing a case report).

Reply 7: We have modified our text as advised

Changes in the text: See Page 4, line 85

- Comment 8: As in the introduction I suggest that the authors review the references and use more current references (only 1 reference 2022 and 1 2021 or older), To make the discussion more concise.

Reply 8: Recent references are used with modifications in format which was advised.

Changes in the text: See Page 3-4, line 45-85

- Comment 9: In addition, the discussion has no connection between the subtitles. It seems to be just a collection of information present. It is also interesting to make the connection with the clinical case presented, and not only to inform at the beginning which tooth presented such an anatomical variation.

Reply 9: Literature review and Discussion are separately mentioned and are correlated with our clinical case.

Changes in the text: Page 9, line 193-195; Page 13, line 287-318

- Comment 10: The references are not in order of appearance in the text. The introduction ends with reference 7 and the discussion begins at 16. Authors should review this, as well as whether all references are cited in the text.

Reply 10: References after introduction are mentioned in Table 1 (Ref-11 to 35)

Changes in the text: -

- Comment 11: Please, include a paragraph with the clinical relevance, and one of the limitation of this study. I kindly ask that the authors review the journal's articles standards and guidelines.

Reply 11: We have modified our text as advised

Changes in the text: Page 15, line 328-343

Reviewer C

- Comment 1: The literature review should be separated from the discussion section.

Reply 1: We have separated literature review and Discussion as advised

Changes in the text: See Page 7, line 154 and Page 13, line 286

- Comment 2: A more resumed conclusion would be better

Reply 2: We have modified our text as advised

Changes in the text: See page 14, line 319

- Comment 3: The figure 3 has a poor quality, try to upload another figure with a better quality or remove it at all.

Reply 3: Figure 1-5 are assembled

Changes in the text: -

Second External Peer Review

Reviewer A

- Comment 1: Why did the authors separate the introduction into sub-items?

Reply 1: We have modified our text as advised

Changes in the text: See Page 3-4, line 44-88

- Comment 2: The authors report in the review that: “Written and informed oral consent was taken from the patient. No ethical committee approval was required.” - This information must be reported in the text.

Reply 2: We have modified our text as advised

Changes in the text: See Page 6, line 124-128

- Comment 3: Clinical relevance and limitations of the study need to be included in the discussion session, and not created in its own session

Reply 3: We have modified our text as advised

Changes in the text: See Page 14-15, line 326-341

- Comment 4: “The authors have completed the CARE reporting checklist” - Should be cited in the material and method and not as footnotes. As well as about the Ethics Committee.

Reply 4: We have modified our text as advised and added it both in footnotes and Treatment section of case report

Changes in the text: See Page 16, line 355,358-364

- Comment 5: The authors should improve the figures. Leaving them standardized. 1C seems to be distorted. The 1D has a border that it does not have on the others.

Reply 5: We have removed border from 1D and is attached with mail

Changes in the text: -