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Reviewer’s report:

General Comments
The paper is greatly improved by the revision and now is a very informative and helpful paper. There is some interesting detail and there is a much clearer sense about the story being told by the article. There are just a few areas where I feel that the paper would be improved even more if there were some further changes.

1. Title:
I think this is an improvement although I wonder whether the following might give readers a better feel for the content of the paper: 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
Add 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.
4. Fig 1 on Page 4 is not necessary and the links to these websites could be included in the text.

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.

Conclusions
6. These should be written in text rather than as bullets.

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.
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.
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