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Dear Professor Thiago Machado Ardenghi
Associate Editor BMC Oral Health (Section Epidemiology of Oral Health)

**Paper:** MS: 1572417255127702  
**Title:** Multilevel analysis of caries in underprivileged adolescents of Brazilian southeast.

We are resubmitting the referred manuscript to the BMC Oral Health. We have revised it according to the suggestions of reviewer. The corrections inside the manuscript are in red color.

**1914892710141707 comment of Reviewer**

**Title:** Individual and contextual factors related to dental caries in underprivileged Brazilian adolescents  
**Version:** 3  
**Date:** 4 September 2014  
**Reviewer:** Fernanda Ferreira  
**Reviewer's report:**

The authors have answered most of my doubts, requirements and suggestions. However, there are some points that were still not properly addressed, one from Major Compulsory Revisions and two from Minor Essential Revisions.

1. **Major Compulsory Revisions**

I am not convinced about the suitability of including the variables "need for dental prosthesis" and "toothache" in the models to explain dental caries. For the reasons I have outlined in my first review, I still believe that these variables should be removed from the models.

**Response:** Considering the reviewer's suggestion, we removed these variables from the models. So, the alterations were made in the manuscript, excluding all the informations related to these variables.

2. **Minor Essential Revisions**

I could not find in the text where the authors inserted information about what exactly was considered as "caries teeth" in the study. Could the authors please assist me on this? In fact, it would help a lot if the authors refer to items under discussion using paragraph references or manuscript page numbers.

**Response:** In fact, when the authors mentioned in the text "caries teeth" would be "number of decayed teeth." The alteration was made in the manuscript (page 3, line 73 and 85)
When I suggested in my first review that the authors present a description of the contextual variables, I was expecting to see the distribution of the suburbs according to these variables. However, the authors presented the descriptive to the variable "index of social exclusion" as if it were an individual variable (Table 1), which does not seem appropriate, since this was considered a contextual variable in the study.

Response: Considering the reviewer comment, table 1 was redone.

Yours Sincerely

Fabiana Vazquez