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Dear Editor BMC Oral Health

First of all we would like to thank for the rigorous analysis the reviewers have done. We do believe their observations have implemented very much our paper. We have read all suggested papers and included the references where appropriated, resulting in alterations in the text, mainly at the “Background” and “Discussion” sections.

Please find below our answers to their suggestions:

**REVIEWER 1**

“Title, it does not represent the study, please change it to:

**Malocclusion, dental aesthetic self-perception and quality of life in a 18 to 21 year old population: a cross section study**”

**AUTHORS**

It was done as asked.

**REVIEWER 1**

“Please remove the 1st and 2nd sentence of the background as it is not relevant to the topic of this research. Remove the corresponding parts of the introduction as well.
Instead you can put a small paragraph about the long term effect of malocclusion on general or oral health/psychological (which is minimal). The relevant citations should be:
Seminars in Orthodontics, Volume 18, Issue 3, September 2012, Pages 210–216

**AUTHORS**

Those paragraphs were removed. It was written another text including the suggested references.

**REVIEWER 1**

“2nd paragraph in the introduction is not accurate, there is no evidence that malocclusion can affect the psychosocial well-being or dental health in the long term, read the articles mentioned above and the following articles and rewrite this paragraph:
A review of the evidence supporting the aesthetic orthodontic treatment need indices, Progress in Orthodontics, doi:10.1016/j.pio.2012.03.003
A review of the evidence supporting the aesthetic orthodontic treatment need indices, Progress in Orthodontics, doi: 10.1016/j.pio.2012.03.003”

**AUTHORS**

The 2nd paragraph was adjusted including the suggested references.

**REVIEWER 1**

“Rewrite the 3rd paragraph
Remove or rewrite the 4th paragraph, issues have been mentioned earlier”

**AUTHORS**

It was done as asked.
REVIEWER 1
“Change methods section to subjects and methods
AUTHORS
It was done as asked.

REVIEWER 1
“The ethical approval shouldn’t be at the end of methods section, please add it in the beginning of this section”
AUTHORS
It was done as asked.

REVIEWER 1
“Why Brazilian Army soldiers were used as the study sample”
AUTHORS
It was a methodological decision. The main reason was the easy access to this population resulting in facilities in term of logistic. Moreover, we have discussed in the manuscript the possible bias in relation to the external validity of using this convenience sample.

REVIEWER 1
“Add separate sub-heading for the assessments used in the study, DAI, DMFT, dental aesthetic self-perception and quality of life Add a separate heading for statistical analysis”
AUTHORS
It was done as asked.

REVIEWER 1
“I can see that the DMFT and DAI were calculated, please assess the relationship between these two variables, the relevant citation could be Acta Odontol Scand. 2011 Jan;69(1):2-11. Please read it and compare your results with it.”
AUTHORS
The possible relationship between DMFT and DAI was assessed through the multiple logistic regression analysis. We found, as it can be observed in Table 4, that the DMFT did not significantly influenced the DAI behavior in the adjusted analysis. As you have suggested, we carried out the correlation analyses between both. The Spearman’s rho was 0.003 (p=0.971). In this way we believe it is not necessary to add this correlation results in the manuscript.

REVIEWER 1
“Shortcoming of the Aesthetic orthodontic indices should be mentioned, particularly the subjectivity associated with the use of these indices. Authors should mention that the DAI does not represent all occlusal traits, this has been explained before in one of the articles I mentioned before: A review of the evidence supporting the aesthetic orthodontic treatment need indices, Progress in Orthodontics, doi:10.1016/j.pio.2012.03.003”
AUTHORS
It was done as asked.
The literature review is deficient. Some important papers are missing including the following ones, please read them and rewrite the discussion and introduction accordingly:


AUTHORS
All suggested papers were read and included in “Background” and “Discussion” sections.

REVIEWER 1
“Rewrite the conclusion after reading the articles mentioned earlier, there are some strong comments in it, which are not necessarily true.”

AUTHORS
It was done as asked.

REVIEWER 2
“The sample consisted in young militar males between 18 and 21 years old so the sample is not representative at all. We can not extrapolate this conclusions and compare them with to other populations with a representative sample. The authors should keep this in mind for future studies.”

AUTHORS
Thank you very much.

REVIEWER 2
“The authors have used the Oral Aesthetic Subjective Impact Scale (OASIS) which is a 5 questions scale to analyze the oral aesthetic self-perception. In futures studies, the authors should use others questionnaires like PIDAQ (23 items questionnaire) in order to get more information about the patients perfeceptions (aesthetic concern or psycological impact of aesthetics)”

AUTHORS
Ok. Thanks for your suggestion. We definitively will consider using such a scale.

REVIEWER 2
“Getting sociodemographic data is quite difficult but regarding this issue; the authors decided a cutoff point at 8 years of schooling. The authors should explain the reasons od this decision. They should explain also the cutoff point of the “per capita income”.”
AUTHORS
8 years of schooling cutoff point: this number of years schooling represents, in Brazil, the final of the primary degree of formal education. This information was added in the manuscript.
Per capita income cutoff point: as mentioned in the text, the cutoff point was established at the median of the per capita income’s distribution - BR reais of 525.00

REVIEWER 2
“- Typographical errors
In BACKGROUND (2nd paragraph) the reference is wrong: “affecting social relationships2” instead of “affecting social relationships [2]”.
In RESULTS AND DISCUSIÓN (8th paragraph) the reference is wrong: “for orthodontic treatment need in adults18” instead of “for orthodontic treatment need in adults [18]”.
In RESULTS AND DISCUSIÓN (12th paragraph) the reference is wrong: “Marques et al.21” instead of Marques et al. [21]”.

AUTHORS
The corrections were done.

REVIEWER 3
“Minor Essential Corrections: The title needs some revision. Instead of .....life in male young adults .......", it should read .....life in young male adults .......

AUTHORS
The corrections were done as asked by reviewer 1.

REVIEWER 3
“Under the Methods, the second paragraph should be deleted completely. The authors should just indicate that they examined only 138 subjects out of possibly 150 subjects invited.”

AUTHORS
It was done as asked.

REVIEWER 3
“Also, under Results and Discussion, the authors should note that that their total sample was not their total sample but could be regarded as their target population. Their total sample was 138 subjects. These are very important corrections to be made before acceptance.”

AUTHORS
It was done as asked.

Sincerely yours.

Dikson Claudino and Jefferson Traebert