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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor

We would like to thank the reviewers for their efforts regarding the review of our manuscript. We have considered their recommendations and made several amendments to deal with the suggestions made. We have included a detailed point-by-point reply to the comments and the respective changes are highlighted yellow in the main document.

Reviewer reports:

Editor in Chief:

Availability of data and material: This concerns your results and not the references. Please remove "All references are available at pubmed.com". You can add "Data are available on request from the authors." if you would like to share your data.

The sentence was changed accordingly.

Acknowledgements: Receiving material and using a lab or lab support is a kind of financial advantage. Please clarify this under competing interests, too.
The following sentence was added to competing interests: “The materials were kindly provided by 3M Espe, Ivoclar Vivadent, Kuraray and Vita Zahnfabrik without rights on the outcome of the study.”

Reviewer #1: Language review - as before, still excellent.

Thank you very much.

Reviewer #2: Thank you very much to the authors for addressed all my comments so carefully. Now I’m satisfied with the given replies. Authors should only clarify in the discussion, the correlation between the macro shear method employed, with the low SBS values obtained here, compared to the most data available in the literature on this topic, just to clarify the reader why the values here are generally lower than others in literature. I consider the paper actually improved its quality after this peer reviewing process. Thank you.

Thank you very much for your valuable comment. We added the following sentences to the discussion according to the suggestion of the reviewer:

“Consequently, fractures occur at lower force levels than when specimens are sheared without distance. SBS values of the present study are therefore lower and cannot be compared to previous studies using the same test set-up [33, 50]”

Reviewer #3: Well done! I think now you have a great paper.

Thank you very much.