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Dear Editor:

Thanks a lot for all comments. We have revised our manuscript according to each of them. Our manuscript has been improved significantly. Below are the details of the changes we made.

With my best regards,

Yu Cao

Capital Medical University School of Stomatology

Tian Tan Xi Li No.4

Beijing 100050

P.R. China

E-mail: caoyu_bj@163.com

Response to Comments:

1. Can the authors please clarify what the two figures are at the end of the main manuscript? There is no figure number, and they don’t match with any of the other figures. If the authors wish to submit them as supplementary information, please upload them as a
supplementary file and given them a title and description – both within the file itself and under the heading ‘Additional files’ after the Figure legends.

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. In the revised manuscript, we have Incorporated the RUNX2 real time PCR figure to Figure 3 as Figure 3D. Incorporated the negative control staining to Figure 4 as Figure 4D.

2. Under ‘Ethics approval and consent to participate’, please clarify if all patients provide written informed consent or were they told in the form of a written letter. This is also a problem within the 'Methods'. What do the authors mean by "Patients with written informed consent were..". Who obtained the written informed consent?

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. In the revised manuscript, Under ‘Ethics approval and consent to participate’, all patients provide written informed consent. Within the 'Methods', Wisdom teeth were obtained from patients who provided written informed consent according to guidelines approved by the ethical committee.

3. While assessing your manuscript in-house, we found several instances in the Title, Abstract, Background, Methods, Results, Discussion, and Conclusion sections where the text displayed similarities to text found in other previously published articles. These include but are not limited to: Qu, B. et al. Cell Tissue Res (2014), Wang, JJ et al. Int J Clin Exp Med (2015), Yu G et al. Cell Proliferation (2016). This degree of text overlap is not acceptable in its current form, and thus we must request that you rewrite your manuscript to reduce the level of text overlap with your re-submission.

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. In the revised manuscript, we have rewrited the manuscript.

4. On uploading your revisions, please remove any tracked changes or highlighting and include only a single clean copy of the manuscript.

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. In the revised manuscript, we have removed all tracked changes and highlighting.

5. Please re-draft the ‘Funding statement’ to read “This work was supported by grants from the National Natural Science Foundation of China (81670948) to YC and China
Rehabilitation Research Center foundation (2017ZX-03) to HW.” The rest of the text is already there in the ‘Author contribution’ section and does not need to be repeated.

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. In the revised manuscript, we have re-drafted the ‘Funding statement’.

6. Please also copy-edit the manuscript with either a native English speaker or a professional copy-editing service to ensure the quality of English is suitable for publication.

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. In the revised manuscript, we have copy-edited the manuscript with the professional copy-editing service.

Reviewer reports:

Shaomian Yao (Reviewer 2): Incorporate the RUNX2 real time PCR figure to Figure 3 as Figure 3D.

Incorporate the negative control staining to Figure 4 as Figure 4D

The discussion of WIF1 on RUNX2 data is not sufficient. For example, since WIF1 overexpression did not significant effect on RUNX2, are there any observations (reports) suggesting that RUNX2 upregulation is not required for dentinogenic differentiation?

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. In the revised manuscript, we have Incorporated the RUNX2 real time PCR figure to Figure 3 as Figure 3D. Incorporated the negative control staining to Figure 4 as Figure 4D. There are no reports suggesting that RUNX2 upregulation is not required for dentinogenic differentiation.