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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Sirs,

The authors are very grateful for the wishful and detailed comments by the Editor and Reviewers. We have tried to do our best to address all of them, hoping to have understood well.

Information concerning ethical approval has been added to the Material and methods section as suggested by the Editor. The “Competing interest” information has been added after “Conclusions”.

The methods section has been corrected and expanded according to the Reviewers’ suggestions; the teeth selected for this study were all third molars from patients aged 16-24 years. Selection criteria have been described and the description of bonding procedure has been expanded as proposed by both Reviewers.

No calculations were used to assess sample size, since we expected (and really could see) a great difference between the surface before bonding and after debonding. We aimed to analyze as many teeth as possible. However, the calculations for the first 15 teeth took two weeks (10 work days, 8 hours a day) and provided clear results we decided to submit to this high-level interdisciplinary journal.

The aims and conclusions have been corrected as proposed by both Reviewers. Figures from scanning and superimposition procedures have been added as proposed by the Reviewer Professor Domenico Dalessandri. Detailed figure captions have been added after the References.

The authors have read the study by Ferreira et al. (2013), however we don’t know how to compare the results of the present study with the aforementioned. The study by Ferreira et al. is assessing enamel roughness of very small enamel areas (300 µm x 300 µm) in terms of comparing different methods of polishing after removing adhesive remnants with tungsten carbide bur. No assessment of adhesive remnants or enamel loss has been described in that study, which could
serve for any comparison.

Paragraph “Clinical Relevance” as well as the sentence on leaving composite remnants (from conclusion) have been removed as suggested. The latter has been moved to the “Discussion” section as proposed.

Reference numbering has been corrected as suggested.

Error study was not proceeded, however the precision of the scanner (2 µm was maintained by calibration procedure).

The authors are very grateful for noticing the mistakes concerning storing time (this was a type-setting error and has been corrected) as well as the improper use of “brackets” instead of “molar tubes. We thank for indicating all typing mistakes in values reporting the results of the study.

Details of the GOM software have been added as suggested.

The authors are ready to make any further corrections, if required.

Yours sincerely,

Joanna Janiszewska-Olszowska