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November 21st, 2012

Dear Editor,

Thank you very much for your kind attention with our manuscript entitled “Association between gingival bleeding and gingival enlargement on Oral health-related quality of life (OHRQoL) of subjects under fixed orthodontic treatment: A cross-sectional study” As you have suggested, we are presenting a revised version to be considered for publication.

Having considered point by point the queries of the referees, we now think that the manuscript has improved in quality and that it can be considered for publication.

Sincerely,

Fabricio Zanatta
Adjunct professor
Dept of Stomatology
Universidade Federal de Santa Maria
Santa Maria, RS, Brazil
E-mail: fabricioznanatta@gmail.com
• Reviewer's report (Dr. Kerstin Öhrn)

I am happy with the revised version with one exception. It is not appropriate to include subject's education in the analyze, because the participants were too young and information on their exact age was not available. Consequently I want you to remove education from all analyzes.

Answer: As the reviewer suggested informations about education data were removed in the methods, results, discussion sections and in all analyses.

• Reviewer's report (Dr. Atsushi Saito)

The authors satisfactorily addressed the comments made by the reviewer. I feel OHIP14 (subscript) should be expressed as OHIP-14.

Answer: It was replaced OHIP_{14} to OHIP-14 in all document.

• Editor's report (Dr. Christopher Foote)

Just one additional comment to add to my previous letter; although the quality of English in your manuscript is generally good, the first sentence of your abstract (beginning ‘There are scarce evidence...’) is rather poorly written. Could you please rewrite this sentence in your revised manuscript?

Answer: The sentence was corrected. Now it’s as following: “...There are scarce evidences that evaluated…”