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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

First of all thank you for using the open peer review system. There is a serious difference of opinion between the two reviewers. The first reviewer has accepted the manuscript as it was, and the other reviewer has rejected.

In the light of the opinion of the editor that “They have raised a number of points which we believe would improve the manuscript and may allow a revised version to be published in BMC Oral Health” the following revisions were deemed appropriate as a joint opinion of all authors.

The second reviewer has criticized the manuscript that “Needs some language corrections before being published”. Professional advice for our article has already been received after the English correction proposal from the editor on December 8 (Scribendi-#492589/https://www.scribendi.com/tracking?o=492589&k=Y2c5TzYj9yZf).

Please let us know if there is a new requirement about language corrections.

Thank you for your time.
Best Regards,
Dr. Işıl Sarıkaya

Two typos errors were corrected.

Page 8 Line 178 “E1C” corrected as “E1c”,

Page 8 Line 181 “E1C” corrected as “L1c”,

Reviewer 2:

Major issues:  1) The presented hypothesis was supported with the literature.

“There is also only a limited knowledge on the effect of surface roughness on the color of ceramic after it has been subjected to a staining agent in the literature [9-12].” at line 77-79 in Page 4.

“It remains unclear what the underlying mechanism is” expression is show that the subject was not understand by the second reviewer.

2) New literature was added to the background of the manuscript.

[9-12].” at line 77-79 in Page 4.

In response to the expression “Also the studied materials need to be introduced”

Tablo 1 was revised. And the materials’ “filler type” and “particle %weight” were added.

3) There is conflicting views with the two reviewer’s on statistics about the manuscript. But manuscript was reviewed by a professional statistician. Statistical analysis section was wrote again, consisting with rational of the chosen statistical tests as well as sample size.

4) Two sentences related to the present study’s outcome were added to the conclusions section.
5) The ceramic groups’ names labeled with codes in the tables for the purpose of consistent throughout.

“Enamic” corrected as “HC” in Tables 2, 3, and 4,

“Lava Ultimate” corrected as “RNC” in Tables 2, 3, and 4.

6) The presentation of the data in tables and figures is thought illustrative.

7) “The authors should follow the suggestions of BMC and make the raw data available via an accessible database” reported the second reviewer. If desired we can get the raw data.