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Dear Dr. Henderson,

I am writing this letter in response to the review of our manuscript “End Stage Renal Disease as a Modifier of the Periodontal Microbiome”. I would, first, thank the reviewers for the constructive review and comments. We have revised the manuscript based on the reviewers’ comments. Below is a point-by-point summary of edits with their location in the manuscript. All changes in the manuscript are highlighted using “Track changes”.

Reviewer 1

1. p. 7, line 13: Stenvinkel et al. 1999 is not listed in the references
   We have modified the reference list, adding the above reference. Please see p. 7, line 13 and p. 20, reference 19.

2. p. 15, line 14: Vaziri et al. 2013, probably refers to Ref no 13? Please check
   We thank the reviewer for the comment. Indeed, we referred to the Vaziri et al. 2013. We made the appropriate correction on p. 15, line 14 as well as the reference list on page 20, reference 13.

Reviewer 2

1. In the first sentence of the methods section, the authors call this study (quite appropriately) a pilot study. However, the statistical treatment with emphasis on hypothesis testing and the conclusions are inconsistent with the idea of a pilot study.
   We thank the reviewer for the comment. We have revised the manuscript accordingly to underscore the study sample size and its implication on result interpretation and future research implication. Therefore, the Conclusion section of the Abstract was revised (p. 3, lines 19-21) as well as the Discussion section (p. 14, line 21; p. 15, line 8; p. 16, line 12-13; p. 16, line 22).

2. A minor point is that I would be interested to know the reasons for non-eligibility for the majority of the ESRD patients (only 14/52 were eligible).
   We thank the reviewer for the comment. We have revised the Result section of the manuscript to present in details the subjects, who failed the eligibility criteria. Please see p. 11, lines 2-6.

In conclusion, we would like to thank the reviewers for their work on this manuscript that, we believe, has resulted in an improved manuscript. We also thank you for taking the time to review this manuscript and we hope that you will find our revised version suitable for publication in your journal.

Respectfully,
Effie Ioannidou DDS, MDS