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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear Editor,

Cover letter

We authors would like to thank the reviewers and editor for the edits made to the manuscript. The manuscript reads better and the quality of information we would be sharing with readers of the highly esteemed journal has indeed improved. Below are the point by point response made to the peer reviewers’ comments. We also sent the paper to English edits again. We hope this would have helped improve the paper.

Comments from the Editor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 The language needs editing.</td>
<td>We sent the manuscript to an editor for the third time. All edits are highlighted in red in the manuscript. We hope we have addressed all the issues raised in terms of language editing and that the English is now of acceptable standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples of sentences with wrong English: ¿Anomalies of teeth shape¿ ¿What is ¿teeth shape¿?</td>
<td>The sentence has been corrected. See line 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿The study population included all children who were between four months to 12 years of age, for whom parental informed consent to participate in the study was received, was living with biological parents or legal guardians who were capable of giving consent as well as provide study information and was present at home at the time the study was conducted.¿ Is too long and the tenses are mixed up. Both ¿were¿ and ¿was¿ refer to children!!!</td>
<td>The statement on informed consent has been deleted. This is because it is a repeat statement. Information on the consenting process is described in the section on ethics – lines 143 to 147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿The teeth were examined wet after debris had been removed with a piece of gauze when present.¿ Was it gauze or debris which was present?</td>
<td>The sentence has been edited – line 142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could you elaborate what you mean? ¿Only one eligible qualifying child in each household was eligible to participate in the study. Alternate sexes and the next age group identified for study recruitment were selected to participate in each consecutive household.¿ This seems the sample to have been conveniently selected a weakness of the study that needs to brought up in the discussion.</td>
<td>We have tried to make the sentence more explicit. See lines124 – 127. The sample is not a convenient sample. We have used established modalities for household sampling for this study. The process helps to increase age and sex representation in the sample.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the methods section ¿The suitability and applicability of this social classification system for the Nigerian environment has been well-tested and found valid and reliable (24). It has also been used in previous oral health studies to determine the socioeconomic profile of Nigerian children (25). ¿ Are more of the discussion of the method used to determine the SES ¿ should thus be taken to the Discussion section.</td>
<td>The sentence has been modified to make it appropriate for the methodology section. See line 136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Children excluded from the study were those who had a medical condition or syndrome associated with tooth anomalies, those who had cleft palate and those with a history of diseases that could increase the risk for developing dental anomalies such as maternal syphilis. How many were excluded on this basis?

No child met the exclusion criteria. We have included this information in the manuscript. See lines 201 and 202.

Of what value was the test of significant differences in independent variables (see table 1) and in the distribution of the dental anomalies when their prevalence values are extremely too low? Majority of the cells would actually be empty. Presentation of percentages would suffice.

The p values for Tables 1-6 have been deleted. We have left the tables to show percentages only.

Thanks.
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