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**Author’s response to reviews:**

Kiyonobu Honma (Reviewer 3):

I would like to give my comments to the revised manuscript as shown in below.

The authors thank heartily prof. Honma, for his kind comments and respond as follows:

P4 L73,

Please add the reference.

The reference was added as required (background, page 4, line 73).
"OPT" to "panoramic radiograms (OPTs)"

The manuscript was amended (Materials and methods, page 5, line 86).

P6 L120 DNA analysis by pyrosequencing,

Please provide detail about PCR primers data.

Primer sequences were added in the revised manuscript (Materials and methods, page 6, lines from 114 to 116).

P7 L128

"OTUs" to "The operational taxonomic unit(OTU) datas".

The paper was modified accordingly (Materials and methods, page 7, lines 125 and 126).

P10 L204-208

Please provide pathway analysis data.

We cannot add a table since the results of the R package “GAGE” scripts generated only the P value of the statistical test and the results are reported in the main text.

Table 3,

I think, If the authors use separate tables for RCs and PGs that generated from Table 3, and sort the data by OTUs value, then we can understand RCs contains more gram negative bacteria than PGs group. The results will endorse RCs group showed more LPS synthesis pathway than PGs at pathway analysis data.

Propionibacterium should be classified as "facultative anaerobe".
Corynebacterium, Staphylococcus, Actinomyces, Capnocytophaga are too.

The revised table is now split for RCs and PGs and modified following prof. Honma’s suggestion.

Fig 3 is still hard to read.

Can the authors make a table from the Fig.3 data?

To our opinion, the Fig.3 is more readable than the two tables of R and P value. The figure, at the same time, showed the P-values and the R-values. If the correlation is statistically significant (FDR <0.05) you can see the circle that indicate the R value as shown in the scale. As for the resolution, please consider that the PDF proof may be inaccurate even if the source is of good quality.