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Author’s response to reviews:

1. Please address the final reviewer comment found at the end of this email.
   Response: Thank you. We revised the manuscript according to the comment.

2. Please confirm whether informed consent obtained from all participants was written or verbal, and 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.
   Response: Thank you. The study was approved by the Ethics Committee of Peking University and Duke University. Informed consents were obtained from all participants during the face-to-face interview. We stated this in the methods.

3. Please represent authors' names using their full initials, not their full/surname, in the Authors’ Contributions section. If there are any duplicated initials, please differentiate them to make it clear that the initials refer to separate authors.
   Response: Thank you. We revised as suggested
4. Please remove the tracked changes manuscript from the end of your manuscript file as this is no longer needed in the publication process.
Response: Thank you. We revised as suggested

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: Thank you. We revised as suggested

Reviewer reports:

Torsten Mundt (Reviewer 4): The manuscript has been considerably improved. However, the sentence "We did not include an induction period in the primary results as most previous studies, since it may also lead to selection bias." is not true. I see that quite differently. An induction period would strengthen an exposure-outcome relationship between not using dentures and mortality. Therefore, a selection bias by using that is rather unlikely.

I recommend shortening the sentence to "Therefore, we did not include an induction period in the primary results as most previous studies."

Thereafter, the manuscript could be accepted for publication.
Response: Thank you. We revised as suggested