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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear BMC Oral Health editor and reviewers,

Thank you very much for your letter and for the reviewers’ comments concerning our manuscript entitled “Impact of transparent tray-based application of bioactive glasses desensitizer on the permeability of enamel and dentin to hydrogen peroxide: an in vitro study” (ID: OHEA-D-18-00648R1). Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our researches. We have studied the comments very carefully and have made correction which we hope meet with approval. Revised portion are marked in red in the paper. The main corrections in the paper and the responds to the reviewers’ comments are as following.

Response to Dr. Lilaj (Reviewer 1)’s comment:
Thank you for your interests in our work. Based on your instructive suggestions, we accordingly revised the manuscript one by one as follows.

1. Response to comment: Thank you for your response. Unfortunately, I couldn't see the implemented changes added by you. So please send a marked revised version of your manuscript in order to track the changes that you performed.

According to your last comments, we did make the changes in our paper. However, due to the policies of BMC Oral Health, we couldn’t make any mark in our main document, and it might be the reason why you couldn’t see any implemented changes. This time we are trying to upload the marked revised version of our manuscript as an attachment. Hopefully that you can see it.

Response to Dr. Franz (Reviewer 2)’s comments:
Thank you for your interests in our work. Based on your instructive suggestions, we accordingly revised the manuscript one by one as follows.

1. Response to comment: Statistical methods: My comment was misunderstood. Again the chosen post-hoc test for ANOVA is missing in the section "statistical analysis". Did you use the post-hoc test after Tukey or a different one? Please clarify.

   We chose Least Significant Difference (LSD) post hoc tests in our research for multiple comparisons. According to your comment, we added the post hoc tests part in our manuscript.

2. It is not appropriate to present results in one publication twice. Present the data concerning "The amount of pulpal H2O2 in each group" only in table 1.

   According to you comment, we deleted the data concerning the amount of pulpal H2O2 in each group in order to only show the data in Table 1 and Figure 3.

   We tried our best to improve the manuscript and made some changes in the manuscript. These changes will not influence the content of the paper. We appreciate for Editors/Reviewers’ warm work earnestly, and hope that the correction will meet with approval.

Yours sincerely
Tianda Wang