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Reviewer's report:

Generally the paper raises an interesting issue regarding the relationship between depression and anxiety and aggressive periodontitis. More interestingly, the study hypothesized a relationship between dental anomalies and periodontal disease and this was proven true within the limitation of the study.

However, there are some points that need to be highlighted and should improve the layout and the way data are presented.

A. Non-language points:

1. In the METHODS section, it is mentioned that gingival index was recorded for patients. There is no mention in the results and discussion of why and how the data related to this index was used. I feel this index is not necessary to include as the diagnosis of periodontitis was based on CAL measurements.
2. Page 6: line 1: "Each present tooth was examined..." should read: "For measurement of CAL, each tooth was examined...."
3. Date should be added whenever an author name is mentioned within the manuscript (eg. page 3 line 14 & page 4 line 3).
4. Page 6: "The Cronbach's alpha coefficient was 0.94 for CAL, indicating excellent agreement between the examiners." This should be in the RESULTS section NOT METHODS.
5. Page 6: The last paragraph should be in the RESULTS section NOT METHODS.
6. In the results section: first paragraph (and everywhere else, the units of measurement should be mentioned, for CAL: mm)
7. In some places, the authors state that the majority or most of subjects...., where they in fact refer to the group with the highest percentage (NOT the majority). Examples are page 8 line 10 and the last line in the page.
8. In the results section, under "systemic manifestation"s subtitle:
   i. p values mentioned in the text are not shown in the tables, where they have to appear.
   ii. Last line of the paragraph: the text says that the difference was statistically significant. Data say that it was NOT.
9. Page 9: the numbers of HAD scores presented in the text are not the same as those presented in the table. Was it just an error in copying the data?

10. Page 9, in the last two sentences there is a repetition of the same idea. The following sentence should be removed: "However, the difference between cases and controls, with respect to dental anomalies was statistically significant, while"

11. The discussion is a well-constructed one with clear ideas and reasonable interpretation.

B. Tables:

In Table 1, the p values for age are presented in a way that readers may mistakenly think that these values refer to the first subgroup rather than the whole group. This is also seen in other sections of the table and in Table 4. The layout of the table should be modified so that these values clearly refer to the whole group.

C. Language-related notes:

1. In abstract section:
   i. Line 4: the aim of the study was (not is)
   ii. Line 9: to check for the presence (not confirm).
   iii. Line 18: compared to controls.

2. In background section:
   i. Line 8: may involve the crowns (not crown)
   ii. Line 8: so that the size (not and the size) – this reads more clear.

3. In methods section:
   i. Line 11: with diabetes mellitus or blood disorders (not, blood disorders).
   ii. Line 16: add the word “plaque” so the sentence reads: inconsistency between amount of plaque deposits
   iii. Line 17: add the word “periodontal” so the sentence reads: amount of periodontal destruction.
   iv. Line 21: add “in this study” at the end of the paragraph

4. In results section:
   i. Page 8 Line 10: subjects were young, females, unemployed, had…(no need for repetition of “were”.
   ii. Page 9 line 11: the sentence should read: "...between the anxiety and depression scores of AP compared to controls" (not …scores of AP and controls).

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable
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