

2026-02-17

Dear Author,

I would like to thank you for submitting your article to BDS and congratulate you on its acceptance.

I would also like to clarify a few points regarding the article before sending the files for copyediting.

1. On page 11, you use the terms “red line” and “red group.” Do they refer to the same thing?
2. In the Results/Radiopacity section, some values described in the text differ from those shown in the graph. Additionally, the text refers to certain bars in the graph; however, the text states that a particular bar refers to one group, while the graph indicates that the same bar refers to another group.
3. In Figure 4 on page 16, there are two captions for Figure 4a. Is that correct?

If any adjustments to the article are needed, please send me the revised file(s) here so that I can proceed with the process.

Best regards.

2026-02-27

Dear Editor,

We are deeply grateful for your careful review of the manuscript, your comments, and your acceptance of the article for publication in Brazilian Dental Science. As requested, we have revised the text and made the necessary corrections before submitting it for copyediting. Please find the clarifications below:

1. Use of the terms “red line” and “red group”

Yes, both terms referred to the same experimental group. To avoid any ambiguity, the text has been revised and the nomenclature standardized, so that the groups are now identified exclusively by number and composition (Groups 1 through 4) throughout the Results section.

2. Discrepancies between the values described in the text and in the radiopacity graph

After a detailed review, we identified inconsistencies between the textual description and the graphical representation. The results text was rewritten based on the correct statistical data (median and quartiles), eliminating references to colors and approximate values. Thus, the description now accurately reflects the data presented in the figure and table, maintaining complete consistency between the text, graph, and statistical analysis.

3. Figure 4 – apparent duplication of the description of Figure 4a

We clarify that each subfigure (4a–4f) corresponds to a distinct experimental condition, varying in terms of the microorganism evaluated (*Enterococcus faecalis* or *Porphyromonas gingivalis*) and the groups tested. Nevertheless, to make this distinction clearer to the reader, the caption for Figure 4 has been revised to include an introductory sentence explaining the logic behind the organization of the subfigures.

We remain available for any further clarification and thank you once again for your comments, which have helped improve the clarity and quality of the manuscript.

Sincerely