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Dear Editor,

Thank you for considering the revision of the paper. On behalf of all the authors, I am submitting the manuscript “The impact of socio environmental characteristics on domains of oral health-related quality of life in Brazilian schoolchildren” (MS: 4357161588235690). We thank the reviewers for their valuable contributions to our study. We have made the necessary corrections and are sending the manuscript back to you for further appreciation and editorial analyses.

We have revised it according to the reviewer’s suggestions. The answers and comments are highlighted in italics and bold following the recommendations. In the manuscript, the alterations are highlighted in red.

We hope that the editorial board will agree with the corrections made in this study.

Sincerely yours,

Janice Simpson de Paula
Piracicaba Dental School, University of Campinas, SP, Brazil

Corresponding author: Janice Simpson de Paula at Department of Community Dentistry, Division of Health Education and Health Promotion, Piracicaba Dental School, P.O. BOX 52, University of Campinas –UNICAMP, 13414-903, Piracicaba, SP, Brazil. Address e-mail: janicesimpsondp@yahoo.com.br.
Reviewer 1

1) Major compulsory Revisions

1.1. Introduction:
1.1.1 The background and rationale for the study could be strengthened. For instance, more detailed information on the theoretical pathway of the link between socio-environmental characteristics and COHRQoL is needed.

*We included one paragraph about this relationship between oral health, socioenvironmental aspects and OHRQoL, that still needs to be further investigated in epidemiologic studies.*

1.2. Methods

1.2.2. Sample size: please, provide the sample size calculation for the main associations posed in the study (the effect of socio-environmental characteristics in COHRQoL).

*We included the information in methods.*

1.2.3. The use of Poisson regression analysis was a good option instead of an ordinary logistic regression model. However, the analysis should be run considering the clustered sampling.

*A Clustered sampling was considered in calculating the sample and in the analysis of data. In calculating the sample, the design error was considered, with the need for a larger sample. In the Poisson logistic regression analysis, we tested the effect of the cluster which was not significant. Therefore, it was removed from the model.*
Reviewer 2

- Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Discussion section is adequate and understandable, but lacks substance. Authors could discuss better on the significance of the findings and not only stating the results. For example: Gender (female) showed a significant association with all health domains, but authors did not mention or discussed this finding on discussion. 

   We deepened the discussion on the results related to gender and its association with OHQoL.

2. Another point is that untreated dental caries were not associated with oral symptoms and functional limitations; domains which one could expect a significant association. Authors could make an attempting to explain these unexpected results. 

   We believe that the weak association with dental caries is due to the low prevalence of this condition in the population studied and the impact of higher aesthetic issues (such as use of orthodontic appliance) in the perception of the schoolchildren. We included this information in discussion.

- Minor Essential Revisions

1. Abstract:

   The style is good. The authors should insert the term “of this study” here: The aim of this study was to…

   We made the suggested change.

2. The inclusion criteria are adequate. Did the authors exclude children with previous or current orthodontic treatment? It needs to be described.

   The schoolchildren with previous or current orthodontic treatment were excluded in the sample. We included this information in methods.

3. In the 4th paragraph, line 3. Authors have to replace the term OHQoL to OHRQoL.

   We made the suggested change.

- Discretionary Revisions
1. The introduction is well written. Maybe authors reinforce the paragraph where they justify what motivated their research protocol.

*We included one paragraph in introduction about justification and hypothesis of the research.*

2. Authors could explain better how they made the conglomerate analysis to select public and private schools.

*We included more details about this selection.*

3. The authors explained that the CPQ was self administered, but some studies have performed and face to face interview. Authors could cite a recent published study that evaluated the CPQ in both self-administered and interviewer administered forms.


*The reference was included with the justification for self-administrated used of CPQ.*