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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor Prof. Francesco Mangano
Digital Dentistry section of BMC oral health

Thank you very much for reviewing our manuscript.

Please find here attached the revised version of the “Zirconia crowns cemented on titanium bars using CAD/CAM: A five-year prospective case series.” by Antonio Scarano, Marco Stoppaccioli, Tommaso Casolino.
All the changes suggested by the reviewers have been carried out in the manuscript and have been highlighted in green and in red the sentences deleted.
Thank you very much for your interest and assistance.

Comments to Referee’s report 1

1) since the paper focuses on the results obtained with 9 patients, it is correct to define it as a "case series" rather then a "prospective study" so please eliminate the term "prospective" from your title
   -This change has been made in the title.

2) abstract: it has to be completely rewritten. the long background of the abstract is too vague, what CBCT has to do with zirconia crowns? are you talking about guided surgery? (CBCT?) or what? it is not clear what the aim of your study is. please rewrite your
   -The abstract has been rewritten and the English has been improved by a mother tongue speaker.
3) background is well written but unnecessarily long, you should start immediately with the concept of the Toronto bridge and its ………………………Toronto bridges for example from the school of Prof. Gherlone in Italy published on the CAD/CAM Toronto technique and you should shortly report on those studies, because the topic is new, there are only a few studies and they should be mentioned. in your purpose be more specific.
-A new comment and reference have been added in the background section.

4) it is not clear to me why………
-A new comments have been added in the material section.

5) fig. 2 a there is one implant in a strange position. can you explain why?
This implant was placed palatally to avoid extraction of an impacted canine (The patient refused this surgery), and the implant could not be placed at a prosthetically ideal position.

6) no description of your outcome variables nor the statistical analysis. did you use radiographs to control the implants at 3,4,5 years? if yes, you need to say it.
-During the recall visits the clinical stability of the prosthesis and the integrity of the ceramic of the crowns were evaluated.

7) you need to add statistics even if they were simple.
-A percentage of success was added in the results section

8) Results. 4 lines is too little. expand, you need to comment and describe your outcomes. how can you mention complications if you did not describe what a complication actually is?
-The results section has been expanded.

9) discussion. this section should be restructured around the concept on how the digital technologies and the cad/cam technique have an impact on the fabrication of titanium bars for Toronto bridges because these restorations exist since long time, the only real innovation is the cad/cam and the data acquisition that can be different with intraoral scanners, but you did not use it. the study has enormous limitations, 9 cases are nothing, but you do not mention it, and you do not mention about the hygienic issues related to a restoration like a Toronto bridge.

-New information has been added in the discussion section

References. needs integration.

Comments to Referee’s report 2

-This Paper has been mentioned.
2) It has a nomenclature: “The CAD/CAM compound prosthesis”. They authors may need to utilize this term throughout the manuscript and title to facilitate consistency in the literature.
-This correction has been added in the text

3) The first paragraph line 22-29 to be eliminated.
-This paragraph has been deleted

4) The terms “screwed rehabilitation”, “screwed prosthesis” to be substituted by “screw-retained prosthesis”.
-This correction has been added in the text.

5) The second paragraph on page 2 (lines 15-35) needs to be eliminated or re-written
-This paragraph has been deleted

6) They may briefly describe the “Toronto bridge” (metal substructure and acrylic resin teeth and acrylic resin flange on top) and its limitations, reference to the compound prosthesis they are now presenting (cemented zirconia superstructure above a milled metal substructure) and explain the reason the compound prosthesis might do better that the original Toronto bridge. As it is, referring to the Toronto Bridge is

-This concept has been added in the background section

I remain sincerely yours,

Antonio Scarano