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Author’s response to reviews:

To,
The editor Date: 16.08.2020
Anne Menard,
BMC Oral Health
BioMed Central,

Dear editor,
Thank you for considering our revised manuscript “Oxidative stress levels and oral bacterial milieu in the saliva from pregnant vs. non-pregnant women” for publication in BMC Oral Health. We highly appreciate the response provided by the editor and the reviewers. We have taken into consideration the final comment and submitted a clean version of the manuscript without any highlighted text and a copy of manuscript with changes highlighted in red. In the introduction section (page 5, lines 129-131; in the new clean version of the manuscript), a new paragraph has been added explaining about the choice of bacteria SM and LB for this study as suggested by the reviewer 4. Regarding the other changes in the manuscript, 2 new references have been added. Reference section has been thoroughly checked and rearranged after corrections in the text.
Sincerely
Madhu Wagle, BDS
Research Fellow
Department of Clinical Medicine
UiT The Arctic University of Norway
E-mail: madhu.wagle@uit.no

Oxidative stress levels and oral bacterial milieu in the saliva from pregnant vs. non-pregnant women
Response letter to the reviewer

We sincerely thank all the reviewers who have contributed their valuable time to read comment on our manuscript that has helped us to improve it substantially. Here follows an itemized response to their comments:

Reviewer reports:

Reviewer 1: The authors responded well to the comments, and the manuscript has been improved substantially. My main concerns were the small sample size and the lack of oral clinical examination, both of which were highlighted in the discussion and listed as potential limitations. Therefore, I recommend acceptance of this work in its current form.

Answer: Thank you very much for your positive comment and recommendation for acceptance.

Reviewer 2: Thank you for addressing my comments. The manuscript have been improved substantially.
Answer: Thank you so much for the feedback.

Reviewer 4: Page 5, lines 129-131: Oxidative stress in saliva in association with bacterial milieu in pregnant women has not been reported. So, why did you focus on only Streptococcus mutans (SM) and Lactobacillus (LB)? Did you focus on SM and LB because these are major bacteria in the saliva of pregnant women? Or, did you focus on these oral bacteria based on the previous study of the association between dental caries and oxidative stress in saliva? I think it is unclear why you chose these oral bacteria when making your hypothesis based on the introduction. Please describe about this concern in the "Introduction" section.

Answer: Thank you for the comment. We have now added sentences in the introduction section (Page 5, Line 129-131) with reference explaining about the choice of oral bacteria SM and LB for this study.