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Author's response to reviews:

Reviewer's report 2:
Thank you so much for your review and constructive suggestions.

1. Title:
Answer: We have chosen the suggested title: Scandinavian systems monitoring the oral health of children and adolescents: an evaluation of their quality and utility in the light of modern perspectives of caries management.

2. Key words
Answer: We have added caries epidemiology to key words.

Background
3. Second paragraph seems to interrupt the flow of the argument a bit and I wonder whether it’s best to remove this.
Answer: We have removed it.

4. Fig 1 on Page 4 is not necessary and the links to these websites. The could be included in the text.
Answer: We think the figure gives the reader a better overview than only a description in the text. So we ask if it can be included.

Methods
5. I’m still confused by the terminology used around registrations (line 10), results line 2 etc. In England we would normally talk about routines used to ‘monitor’ oral health as opposed to ‘register’ oral health. This may be because the systems are different, but it might help international readers to understand if this was explained more fully.
Answer: We have changed the terms to “monitor” for internationally better
understanding.

Conclusions
6. These should be written in text rather than as bullets.
Answer: This has been done.

Figures and Tables
7. Table 1 is useful, but Table 2 doesn’t add to the paper. As I understand it, the figures in the tables are not important in themselves to the story of the table, and the point being made is about the type of data being collected as in the column headings. If this is the case, this could be written in the text.
Answer: Table 2 is removed.

8. The title of Figure 2 is too long. The figure itself should have a key to describe what any symbols mean and a label put on the arrows. Then there could be a footnote to the Figure if additional explanation is required.
Answer: We have now denoted the curves, so it should be clear which curve belongs to which group. We have also shortened the title, but included additional explanation in a footnote as suggested. However, we found the figure to be too overloaded when we tried to make a label on the arrows.

We have written “Declaration of competing interests”.