

Dear Reviewer:

Thank you for your comments concerning our manuscript titled "Pulp revascularization and the apical barrier technique induced root development of two nonvital immature teeth in the same patient: a case report" (NO: 83383). Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper. We have studied your comments carefully and have made corrections which we hope meet with approval. Revised portions are marked in red in the paper. The main corrections in the paper and the responses to your comments are as flowing:

REVIEWER 1:

1. "3-mo", "6-mo", "12-mo"? Spell check.

Response: Thanks for your suggestion and we are sorry for the confusions made by our writing. However, we have to explain to you that "3-mo" "6-mo" and "12-mo" in the manuscript represent "3-month" "6-month" and "12-month". We learned this expression from another manuscript of World Journal of Clinical Cases (NO: 79341). We think this expression meets the requirements of the journal, so we do not make any changes.

2. "both of the teeth were asymptomatic". Rephrase.

Response: Thanks for your suggestion and we are sorry for the poor English writing. We have change it to: "both teeth were asymptomatic" in the manuscript.

REVIEWER 2:

2. The main complaint and current medical history in the case report are described in a disordered chronological order, such as "two days" first and "four months later" later.

Response: Thanks for your suggestion and we are sorry for the confusions made by our writing. We have rewritten the "chief complaints" section as the following paragraph:

A 10-year-old girl complained of pain in the right upper posterior teeth for 2 days before visiting; four months later, she visited again and complained of pain in the right lower posterior teeth for 2 days.

2. In the treatment part of the case report, "After fully understanding the advantages and disadvantages of the two techniques, the patient chose pulp revascularization" (paragraph 5, page 3), the basis for the evaluation of the children's teeth and the advantages and disadvantages of the two treatment options could be specified .

Response: Thanks for your suggestion. However, we think the "basis for the evaluation of the children's teeth" have been described in the "Physical and radiographic examination" section, and the "advantages and disadvantages of the two treatment options" have been narrated in the "Discussion" section. So, if we make it specified in the treatment part, we think the content will be redundant with other sections of the manuscript. So, we do not make any change in this part.

3. The conclusion of Gabriel FN cited in the discussion section of this article (paragraph 2, page 9) may be better moved to the background section.

Response: Thanks for your suggestion. We have cited the conclusion of Gabriel FN in the background section as the following sentence: "In addition, a meta-analysis of several clinical studies concluded that pulp revascularization has no significant advantages over other treatments."

However, we think the conclusion of Gabriel FN is indispensable in the discussion section, so we leave the discussion section unchanged. Hope it can meet with your approval this time.

4. Arrows and other marks can be used in the pictures to point out the lesions or operation sites, which can make the article more readable.

Response: Thanks for your suggestion. We have added arrows in the figures as your suggestion.