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Author’s response to reviews:

Thank you for your review of our paper. A point-by-point response has been provided below.

All changes to the manuscript are indicated in the text by using track changes.

1. The logic through this paper may be summarized as follows:

1) Amounts of C. albicans, C. glabrata and low saliva flows were associated with presence of atrophic glossitis as shown in Table 3.

2) Denture wearing is also associated with presence of atrophic glossitis as shown in Table 4.
3) While, those associated factors were confounded in each other as shown in Table 5.

4) To adjust the confounding, multiple logistic regression analysis was performed and consequently, the most significant factor was amount of C. albicans as shown in Table 6.

5) Therefore, C. albicans should be specially considered as a treatment target for Candida-related atrophic glossitis.

Thus, results shown in figures 2-4 are additional and different from the context above. Authors should describe why they carried out such the analyses before the results presentation section (p.9, 2nd line from the last line). In addition, analyses of relationships of amounts of total Candida and C. glabrata might not be needed, since only C. albicans was the significant in the logistic regression analysis.

Response: We have added a sentence in the Results section, 2nd – 4th line, Page 10. And, we have removed the analyses of total Candida and C. glabrata

2. Revision concerning two-way ANOVA is not sufficient. Two-way ANOVA is applicable for parametric variables. Are amounts of Candida parametric?

In addition, the figure 2-4 do not show the differences by levels. These indicate differences between 4 groups. Please consider the way of statistical analyses and presentations.

Response: We have used Kruskal-Wallis H test followed by multiple comparison testing using Mann-Whitney U-test with Bonferroni correction instead of Two-way ANOVA. Method section, Line14, Page 7; Results section, line 6 - 14, Page 10; Discussion section page 14; and Figure 2.

In this analysis, we used SSFR instead of RSFR, because the factor that was closely associated with the presence of atrophic glossitis was SSFR, not RSFR, according to the logistic regression analysis.
3. Table 5

Avoiding readers' puzzling, SSFR line should be added below RSFR line even if the line becomes blank.

Response: We have corrected the Table 5.

4. Table 6

Gender and Denture may be dummy variables. Please add note the details such as Gender; male: 1, female: 0, Denture; denture wearer: 1, no denture: 0.

Response: We have added a footnote in the Table 6.