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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editors:

On behalf of my co-authors, we appreciate editors and reviewers very much for their positive suggestions on our manuscript entitled "A Comparative Study of the Micro-tensile Bond Strength and microstructural differences between Sclerotic and Normal Dentine after Surface Pretreatment" (OHEA-D-18-00564R1).

Editors’ comments:
1. Please address the reviewer's comments at the end of this email.
Response: Done as advised.

2. Please confirm whether informed consent, written or verbal, was obtained from all participants to use their teeth in your study. Please clearly state this in your Methods and Ethics approval and consent to participate sections. If verbal, please state the reason and whether the ethics committee approved this procedure. If the need for consent was waived by an IRB or is deemed unnecessary according to national regulations, please clearly state this, including the name of the IRB or a reference to the relevant legislation.
Response: Actually, patients were requested if they could provide their teeth to be used in our study, and agreement forms were signed from patients. I have stated this in the Methods and Ethics approval and consent to participate sections. “In addition, patients were requested if they could provide their teeth for this research. Informed consent form was obtained and signed from patients when they gave consent.”

3. Please include a statement in your Funding section describing the role of the funding body in the design of the study, the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript.
Response: We have made revision in our Funding section. This work was financially supported by the Jiangsu Qinglan Project Foundation and the Foundation of the Priority Academic Program Development of Jiangsu Higher Education Institutions.
4. Please ensure that all figures/tables and supplementary files are cited within the main text (this does not include the declarations). Any items which are not cited may be deleted by our production department upon publication. Currently, table 4 is not cited.
Response: Table 4 is cited in the part 1 of results section.

5. At this stage, please upload your manuscript as a single, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colours. All relevant tables/figures/additional files should also be clean versions. Figures (and additional files) should remain uploaded as separate files.
Response: Done as advised.

The point-to-point responses to the reviewers’ comments are as following:
Cleonice Silveira Teixeira (Reviewer 1): OHEA-D-18-00564-R1
Thank you for your wonderful and careful suggestions. We have made revision related to the English language of the article.
Main points:
1. Abstract:
Methods: "Each group was randomly subdivided into eight groups and pretreated with different solutions of the 35% phosphate, 15% EDTA, 5% or 10% NaClO".
I suggest changing for: "Each group was randomly subdivided into eight subgroups according to the solution used: 35% phosphoric acid, 15% EDTA, 5% or 10% NaClO."
And I suggest to change '35% phosphate' for '35% phosphoric acid' throughout the text.
Response: Done as advised. We have changed for: "Each group was randomly subdivided into eight subgroups according to the solution used: 35% phosphoric acid, 15% EDTA, 5% or 10% NaClO."

We appreciate for Editors’ and Reviewers’ warm work earnestly, and hope that the correction will meet with approval.

Best regards,
Xin Wei, DDS, PhD
Department of Conservative Dentistry and Endodontics,
Stomatological Hospital, Nanjing Medical University,
Nanjing, China
Email: weixinart@163.com