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Minor Essential Revisions

1) *It should be pointed out that this is a simple descriptive study and not a study testing hypotheses, as suggested in the background section.*

Wording in text modified so that readers are aware that the investigation was a simple descriptive study as opposed to a study testing hypothesis.


2) *It would be helpful if the authors were able to define more clearly the study population*

A more comprehensive description of the study population provided in the Background.


3) *The time period under review could be made more precise*

The period of the study was from 1 July 1993 until 30 June 2004.


4) *The +/- is not required in parentheses next to rate per 100,000*

The +/- sign has been removed from Figure 1.

5) *It would be helpful if the distinction (between 0–4 and 5–9 year age groups) was set out in the methods section.*

The distinction between the two age groups was defined in the methods, as suggested.
6) The authors suggest that the usually observed male/female ratio of DGA altered in 1995-1996. The data do not support this.


7) Similarly in Table 2, rural/remote-dwelling children had higher admission rates than metropolitan children. This is not reflected in the text.

Modification of text Page 6, Paragraph 2, Lines 18–19.

Response to Editor

1) Research that is reported in the manuscript must have been performed with the approval of the appropriate ethics committee.

Data for this research was obtained from the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, with which the Australian Research Centre for Population Oral Health, University of Adelaide (the employer of the two authors) has a memorandum of understanding that data can be analysed and published. All data is de-identified. Because data is collected primarily for administrative purposes, and is de-identified, the University of Adelaide Human Research Ethics Committee did not consider ethical approval to be necessary.