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Dear Authors,

Thank you for the revised manuscript. Here are my comments:

1. Though you have indicated that you have added details about the GBR - how and why it is needed in the discussion section, I am unable to see/ read/ infer the additions. Since this forms a part of your title I think it should generate more discussion. Could you please indicate the additions in the color red?

2. There is also a claim that 'the GBR on fresh sockets is what makes the article unique' and thus separates it from previous articles. Again, I am unable to see this emphasized in the discussion part of the article. I would like you to emphasize the GBR portion of the case series, in both the methods and the discussion sections in order to generate more interest especially readers like me; because, the conclusion you have come to : 3D replica of donor tooth for tooth autotransplantation that can improve it success rate - is not a new one.

3. The manuscript reads better than before but is still far for being thoroughly proofread containing several grammatical and typographical errors.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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