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Reviewer's report:

General
The combination of both papers makes the study more understandable. The resubmitted paper is well written and easy to read, and has improved significantly. I still regret that little attention had been paid in the Discussion-section on the aesthetics of the PMC crown, as in many West-European countries this will be a serious issue.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
1. The Abstract/Summary is missing;
2. figure 1, photograph #2; please add in text: 'glassionomer luting' before 'cement', just to avoid any misinterpretation;
3. Page 13, last sentence,[between brackets]: please add "Figure' between 'see' and '11'.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
Discussion on the aesthetics of the crown, just half a sentence, is possible on page 29, by adding, after 'The use of Hall ... every child or every GDP': The aesthetics of the crown could be a point of discussion.

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable
**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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