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Author’s response to reviews:

Resubmission cover letter:

Dear Editors, Dear Reviewers,

after a second, careful minor revision, we have resubmitted our article:

"Influence of the implant-abutment connection on the ratio between height and thickness of tissues at the buccal zenith: a randomized controlled trial on 188 implants placed in 104 patients"

to BMC Oral Health.

The modifications have been highlighted in the text using a different colour (blue) and below you will find the responses to all the questions made by the reviewers.

We hope the reviewers will appreciate our efforts to improve the quality of the manuscript.
Regards

Davide Farronato, DDS, PhD, MSc
Department of Medicine and Surgery, School of Dentistry, University of Insubria, Varese, Italy
Email: davide@farronato.it

Point-by-point response to the reviewers:

Reviewer reports:

Scott David Ganz, MS, DMD (Reviewer 1): the authors have successfully revised their work. I kindly ask the authors to check the legends of the last two pictures—maybe there is a mistake there? A final English check is recommended.

Authors’ reply: dear reviewer, we have replaced the labels of the last two pictures where a typing error was present. Now all is ok. We have also carefully checked the English form.

Jaafar Mouhyi, DDS, PhD (Reviewer 2): overall the authors have replied to my criticisms. I have only a few minor comments:

- in the results you should describe the distribution of the implants also in the text, not only in the table. How many implants in group 1? How many implants in group 2? Since the distribution is not homogeneous, due to the randomization process (coin toss) I think this should be highlighted in the discussion of the study reporting it as a limitation.

Authors’ reply: dear reviewer, we have inserted this data in the text too and in the discussion we have further highlighted this limitation.
- in fig. 6 there is a mistake, in the label/legend isn't it "group" rather than "sector"?

Authors’ reply: dear reviewer, we have corrected the figures labels because there was a mistake as also checked by reviewer n° 1. Now all is ok.

- the conclusions should contain a statement of clinical relevance, more clearly

Authors’ reply: dear reviewer, we have inserted and highlighted the statement of clinical relevance.

Raquel Zita Gomes (Reviewer 3): the authors have successfully replied to all my questions. I suggest the authors to include more implant systems in the future studies, from different brands, it would be extremely useful for the readers to have this information.

Authors’ reply: dear reviewer, we fully agree with your consideration and a new study is already running with more implant brands.

Claudio Stacchi (Reviewer 4): The Authors addressed satisfactorily my previous concerns.

Only one point needs to be better clarified:

1) Please mention among the study limitations the fact that the choice of abutment height was made in relation to soft tissue thickness. Underline, supporting it with pertinent references, that the use of short abutments (≤2mm) could negatively influence marginal bone loss irrespective of soft tissue thickness (PMID 31033035, 31382675, 25678247).

We have inserted this new sentence in the limitations of our study and we have added the requested references in order to support the concept scientifically.