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Author's response to reviews: see over
Our responses to Editor’s comments:

As a whole, the authors have now revised their manuscript satisfactorily. A few formality (format) should be corrected and one sentence be deleted. The manuscript is then recommended for publication.
Response: Thanks!

Page2, line 37: instead of facility, it should be facilities
Response: Done

Page2, line 41: instead of therefor should be therefore
Response: Done

Page7, line 120: check if ? or > shall be used.
Response: Changed sign to ≥

Table 1; change from stars to other signs, corresponding to Table 6.
Response: Signs in Table 1 now conform to Table 6 + one additional sign (‘) for the 3-star category

I made the following comment in the last revision:
Page10,§2, lines 193-5: were there only 8 male dentists and 7 female dentists who had treated ED patients? Eight dentists with working experience ≥5 years had treated ED patients? Five with ≤5 years? If so, how could this give statistically significant differences between the groups??

The sentence has been changed and is now intelligible:
Significantly more patients were treated by male compared to female dentists (8 patients vs. 7 patients; p<0.05) and by dentists with longer compared to shorter working experience (8 patients vs. 5 patients; p<0.001).? However, I doubt the meaningfulness to test such small groups and what conclusions can be drawn. This sentence should be deleted.
Response: The sentence is deleted