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Author’s response to reviews:

23.01.2020
Prof Thomas Stamm
Editor-in-Chief
Head & Face Medicine

Dear Prof. Stamm,

With this letter, we are re-submitting our revised manuscript #HAFM-D-19-00084R1, entitled “Comparison of the accuracy of different impression procedures in case of multiple angulated implants”. We appreciated your and reviewers’ constructive criticisms for improving our manuscript. We have carefully considered your all comments and have revised the manuscript accordingly. Herein, we explain how we revised the research paper based on those comments. We offer detailed responses to your comments in point-by-point manner below. Additionally, we have changed figures 4 and 7 with higher resolution and quality images. For further information or if you have any question, please contact me. I can provide any additional information related to this manuscript. Thank you again for your deep and thorough review.

Sincerely,

Dr. M. Wafa Richi
Near East University Faculty of Dentistry Department of Prosthodontics, Lefkosa, Mersin 10, Turkey
RESPONSES TO THE REVIEWER(S)’ COMMENTS

REVIEWER 1
Comment: Language review - a much better read. Well done.
Response: Thank you for the time and effort you spent reviewing our revised manuscript.

REVIEWER 2
Comment: -
Response: -

REVIEWER 3
Comment 1: The manuscript has been significantly improved by the authors' revision process. However, some changes should be made to the way the results are presented.
Response 1: Thank you again for your time and effort to evaluate our revised manuscript. We are pleased to make the revisions you suggested to improve our manuscript.

Comment 2: Since they have generated large amounts of data, good visualization is essential. The newly added box-plots figures 9 & 10 are a good way going in the right direction. But optimization is still necessary:
- To understand the figures and tables alone, the abbreviations must be added to the description of the figures/tables
- The data of box-plots (figures 9 & 10) should be grouped/sorted in some way (with respect to different parameters: different angulations / master models? Different impression techniques?)
- A possibility could also be separation in to different smaller boxplots to optimize the understanding.
- It would be good to understand figures 9&10 alone without having to read the entire manuscript.
Response 2: We edited the box plot figure (Figure 9) by dividing into 6 separate charts according to the master models. We added the description of abbreviations and revised the figure legends following your suggestions. Thank you for your recommendation, we believe the visualization of the figure became better.

REVIEWER 4
Comment: The authors have considered all comments and have revised the manuscript. The issue is relevant for prosthodontics, gerodontology and geriatric dentistry. The passive fit of implant-supported prostheses is one of the most important factors affecting the success of treatment. The authors present a comparison regarding the accuracy of impression procedures for different angulated implants in edentulous maxila.
Response: We want to extend our appreciation to you for the time and effort you spent reviewing our research paper. We are very proud of your positive feedback regarding our study.