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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor of the BMC Oral Health,

We thank you for your attention and for your consideration concerning the manuscript entitled "Evaluation of the level of cortisol, capillary blood glucose, and blood pressure in response to anxiety of patients rehabilitated with complete dentures" (OHEA-D-19-00019). We are resubmitting that article with the corrections and accounting considerations of the reviewers, which can be found below.

We are willing to make further modifications and corrections, if necessary.

Best regards,

Corresponding author

Reviewer #1 Comments:
1. Good study with results. Needs a few language corrections and a better compilation.

Response: The English was reviewed by a native English speaker. We are willing to make further modifications and corrections, if necessary.

Reviewer #2 Comments:

1. Dear Authors, Thank you for your efforts. Please find my comments:

METHODS - Page 5: - Line 44-49: the details you mentioned here are usually presented in the results. So I suggest you move it to Results.

Response: The sentence was moved to the Results section.

2. METHODS - Line 51-54: you wrote “presence of adequate support tissue health, and adequate capacity to answer the questionnaire”. These these two points need to be more specific. The are very general now... please define "adequate" and make it more measurable.

Response: The sentence was rewritten: " The inclusion criteria were: total bimaxillary edentulism, presence of adequate support tissue health with a mucosa with medium resilience, and proper capacity to understand and answer the questionnaire and to expel the saliva in the appropriate container."

3. METHODS - Page 6 - First line: you wrote "New prosthesis were made for the patients". Were the dentures made by the same dentist? or various dentists? Please mention this... Could this in any affect the quality of the denture and hence the patient experience?

Response: All prosthesis were made by the same professional to avoid the interference of different approaches/techniques in the study. We believe that this care is very important to avoid bias in the study or some kind of interference in the results.

4. METHODS - Line 6: I suggest using the term "insertion" instead of the term "installation"

Response: The term was changed.

5. RESULTS - Line 32: here you may add the paragraph from Methods which mentioned those who did not continue and how the number went down from 50 patients to 41. Also, the reader needs to know more about the characteristics of the participants.... age range, socioeconomic status, level of self-care...etc.
Response: The sentence was inserted in the first paragraph: "From the 50 patients selected to the study, two of them moved from the city before the conclusion of treatment and seven did not want to participate after the first application of questionnaires, BP measurement, and salivary and blood collections.". Information related to the age was inserted in the Results: "The mean age of the patients was 73.7 ± 9.30 years, except for 5 patients who did not report this data". Unfortunately, we do not have information related to the socioeconomic status, level of self-care. We apologize for the incident and are willing to make further changes if necessary.

6. DISCUSSION - I believe you had a balanced and reasonable discussion. Thank you for that.

Response: We respect the comment of the reviewer and appreciate their insight.

7. FIGURES - I could not check Fig 1 and Fig 2 because they did not show up in the PDF

Response: We are very sorry for that. Figures were uploaded in a TIFF format.