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Author’s response to reviews:

1. If you did not need formal ethics approval, please confirm that this complies with national guidelines and provide a reference which supports this in your Ethics approval and consent to participate section.

Response: Thank you. Before we started the study, we consulted the ethical issue to the Ethics Committee of Peking University Biomedical Sciences, and we were told that they only review the application involving living laboratory animal. In this study, the goats from the agricultural market had been already sacrificed at the time of purchase. We comply with our latest national guidelines (Laboratory animal-Guideline for ethical review of animal welfare, GB/T 35892-2018) during our research works.

Internationally, other researchers using similar samples also supported no ethics approval for the study. The references are:


2. Please provide more detail on the source of the animals (e.g. commercial purchase or through donation) used in your research, and detail whether any permissions/license were obtained in order to use them. Did you obtain the animals when they were alive?
Response: Four goat maxillaes and four mandibles were obtained from the agricultural market for human daily consumption. The goats had already been sacrificed at the time of purchase. On the other hand, this experiment samples in our study are replacements for living laboratory animals, which is recommended by ethical regulation. According to the law in China, we do not need any permissions/license to use goat jaw bought from agricultural market. (Method, line 3, page 7)

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 added the description of the role of the funding body in the Funding section. (Funding, line 3, page 15)

4. Please upload your multi-panel figures as one figure. I.e. each separate figure (figure 1, figure 2, etc) should be one file, not multiple files.

Response: We revised it. Thanks.

5. Please thoroughly proofread your manuscript to ensure there are no spelling or grammatical errors, or ask an English-speaking colleague or copy-editing company to do so for you.

Response: Thank you! A faculty from a dental school in the US helped us do the thoroughly proof read.

6. 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: We have carefully uploaded the revision that meets the requirements.

Junaid Ahmed (Reviewer 1): 1. The corrections have been done according to the queries raised. 2. Ironically, there are grammatical errors in the replies to the reviewers comments itself!

Response: thank you for recognizing our research. In case there are grammatical errors in the manuscript, a faculty from a dental school in the US has helped us do the thoroughly proof read.

Michele Cassetta (Reviewer 2): The requested changes have been made.

Response: Thank you for your recognition of our research.