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Dear Reviewer 1;

Thank you for your valuable comments which were all addressed.

These sentences were included in the reviewer’s recommendation. “Please include all comments for the authors in this box rather than uploading your report as an attachment. Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included in a text format. Please overwrite this text when adding your comments to the authors”.

All comments were written in the boxes as well as written below.

1- Abstract section, line 47, page 3: the word seven was changed to eight.

2- Background section, line 73 & 74, page 4: the words “resilience & aesthetic” were changed to “resiliency & aesthetics”.

3- Background section, line 94, page 5: was left unchanged because the study was conducted in Jeddah which is a city in Saudi Arabia where no study of this type has been conducted. I widen the range of my search and include the entire country.
4- Method section, line 114 & 115, page 6: this part was rewritten to make it clearer.

“The questionnaire consisted of 31 questions divided into three parts; 6, 21 and 4 questions in each part respectively. The first part had 6 questions which were about demographic data of the participating physicians, the second part included 21 questions about knowledge related to avulsed tooth and its emergency management, and the last part had 4 questions to evaluate the physician's attitudes towards learning and receiving more information in order to properly manage such injuries [see Additional file 1].”

5- Results section, line 130, page 6: as requested this sentence was added “The minimum age of the participants was 25 years and the maximum was 55 years.” To specify the maximum and minimum age of the physicians.

Regarding statistical analysis, frequency and percentage were used in most of the results.

However, to compare the knowledge of different physicians in the different groups Mann-Whitney U test and Kruskal-Wallis H test were used and were explained in “Groups’ comparisons on knowledge level (Table 1)” section page 11 & 12 and presented in table 1. Also, Bonferroni test was used for the comparison of the knowledge of the physicians within each group and was explained in “Comparisons within the groups (Table 6, 7, 8)” section page 15.

6- Discussion section, line 250 to 253, page 19: this part was deleted as you requested, although, discussion is usually started with the objective of the study to remind the readers about it.

7- Discussion section, line 292 to 298, page 20-21: More elaboration on transport media was added as requested. (line 292-294) the sentences were rewritten “Transport media are used to maintain the periodontal ligament cells’ viability, increase their survival and prevent any damage which might cause loss of the tooth in the future as ankylosis and resorption.” (Line 295-298) new sentences were added “Theoretically, the best media for that function are HBSS, ViaSpan and Eagle’s medium. However, they are not used because of their cost and unavailability for everyone. Practically, Milk is considered the best medium because of its convenience, cost and availability as well as its ability to preserve PDL cells viability [3,6].”

8- References section, line 351, 357, 360, 363, 365, 368, 371, 377, 382, page 23-25: page numbers were written uniformly in references # 3, 5-10, 12, 14.
Dear reviewer 2;

Thank you for your valuable comments which were all addressed.

The answers to your objections are listed below:

1- In the lines 102 and 103 authors wrote: „The study targeted physicians that were working in the ER department..." and later in the line 131 they claim: „74.6% of the participants were between 20-39 years old." This is rather confusing because the persons at the age of 20 - 23 are usually still students. This should be explained or changed.

Your observation was correct. None of the participants was 20 years old.

For convenience, I used a round figures to make age intervals (20- 29 & 30- 39 …etc.). However, the minimum age of the participants was 25 years. Therefore, a sentence was added to clarity this confusion “The minimum age of the participants was 25 years and the maximum was 55 years”. Line 131, 132 page 6.

2- Line 124 „Different times were selected in order to encounter as many physicians as possible of different shifts and rotations." Is this relevant for the study? If yes it should be explained why, and if not it should be removed.

This sentence was deleted as requested.