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Author’s response to reviews:

Reviewers comments

Reviewer # 1

No issues raced for correction

Reviewer # 2

Comment (7)- Correct the age in the abstract

Correction done in the abstract- The age was changed to 12 years

Reviewer # 3

Comment 1 and 2

(4.a)- case presentation can be improved by giving more details

(4. b) – better if you can provide more information

Correction: More details on history and examination findings were added to the case presentation as suggested by the reviewer. (Page 4, lines 76-79)
Comment 2 (4)- As the radiological finding present in the occlusal radiograph is not for an odontome, CBCT could have added more value to the case diagnosis, management as well the presentation.

Answer: As the reviewer points out, we accept that a cone beam CT (CBCT) scan would have been ideal in diagnosis, management and the presentation. We accept that the availability of plain radiographs alone was a limitation. (Page 6, lines 119)

The CBCT was offered to the parents of the child, but due to financial and other reasons, they did not consent to further radiological investigations. (mentioned in the case presentation: page 4, lines 84-86/)

Comment 3.(8)- Yes but the value would have been better with a CBCT

Answer to comment 3: We agree with the reviewer. One fact that the authors wish to highlight in this case is this. Since CBCT is not a routine practice in our institution, we like to emphasize its importance in suspected cases such as the presented case.

We highlighted the importance of a CBCT in diagnosing in the conclusion section. (mentioned in the conclusion: page 6, line 126-127)