Dear editor

We appreciate the response from our colleague Dr Keith regarding our paper, although it barely touches the statements of our publication.

Our main interest was to share our findings and observations, precisely the variations of RANTES/CCL5, whose relevance is sustained in numerous papers, in relation to different interventions versus no intervention. We ourselves are continuing to evaluate the parameter as well as the interventions and keep getting corresponding correlations.

The clinical improvement was not part of the study, and we certainly do not limit our patients’ therapeutic options to dental treatments. Nevertheless, we cannot ignore that we see more clinical improvement if we integrate dentistry.

Furthermore, our paper did not contain any treatment indication, as we think that a treatment plan should always be individually discussed and adapted to a number of variables.

We esteem a controversial discussion should be welcomed in medicine and in science in general, to allow for the best patient-centered approach. As for the BMDJ, a German expert opinion report has certainly dampened the BMDJ controversy since 2021.1

Open-mindedness and pattern recognition are important skills in research, targeting results that do not fit into a prefigured concept might be less helpful.2
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