

Reviewer's report

Title: Dental anomalies: prevalence and associations between them in a large sample of non-orthodontic subjects. A cross-sectional study

Version: 0 Date: 20 Nov 2016

Reviewer: Rubens Caliento

Reviewer's report:

Your background is well written, but you focus a lot about genetics, mainly in your 2 first paragraphs (lines 56-66). Considering that your study addresses non-syndromic individuals and you did not do any genetic study in your patients, i recommend you to short your background and resume the 2 first paragraphs into one.

On table 3, insert the confidence interval and put in the legend, the statistic test used.

On table 4, put the statistic test used in the legend.

In lines 225-227 you affirmed that your study confirmed a common genetic origin of different types of dental anomalies. On my point of view, you should rephrase this sentence because you did not make any genetic study on your subjects.

In line 230, change the term "incidence" by "prevalence".

In line 263, insert the p value of your statistic test to the significantly higher percentage of anomalies you studied.

In lines 268 and 269, insert the p (and the confidence interval, if applicable) value of your statistic test to the significantly higher percentage of anomalie you studied.

In lines 278-280, insert the p value (and the confidence interval, if applicable) of your statistic test to the significantly higher percentage of anomalies you studied.

In your conclusion, review the grammar of sentence number 2.

Review your references number 8, 11, 15, 21, 23 and 29.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?

If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?

If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?

If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?

If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English

Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published

Declaration of competing interests

Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?
2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?
3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?
4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?
5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?
6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report

including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal