Reviewer’s report

Title: Prediction of width of un-erupted incisors, canines and premolars in a Ugandan population: a cross sectional study

Version: 4 Date: 10 May 2012

Reviewer: Lysle E Jr Johnston

Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

Page 5--"The coefficients of reliability... were calculated by method of errors...." I have no idea what the "method of errors" is. Indeed, It is unclear what methods were used in the error study. Paired t-tests aren't the way it is usually done, by the way. Pearsonian product-moment correlation isn't either. Intra-class correlation would be better.

Page 6--"probability level was set at 5%" For what? Do they mean that they set their Type I error rate at p<.05?

Page 8--I suggested that their correlations were remarkably high and thus required some comment. I suggested "genetics"; however, I expected more than just "genetic influence" in the discussion. What sort of influence? Greater homogeneity in this African population? What?

Table 1 seems to be descriptive statistics. Accordingly, to what hypothesis do the P<.05 asterisks refer? It makes no sense....

Tables 3 & 4--probability can't be 0; it can round to 0, but it can't BE 0.000. Instead, use P< 0.001

Minor Essential Revisions

Table 5--"Maxillary canine and premolars" has an asterisk, but the 95% confidence interval includes 0--one of the signs is probably missing.

Page 3 (twice)--It is Johnston, not Johnson

Item 23 in Lit cited--Moyers'

Discretionary Revisions

The authors need to decide whether it's to be "t test" or "t-test"

Page 5--It's a good trick to get dental casts to use a pair of sliding vernier calipers. Perhaps getting rid of "using" would be a good idea.
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