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June 23rd, 2012

Drs Moher, Shekelle, and Stewart, Editors in Chief
Systematic Reviews
c/o BioMed Central
236 Gray's Inn Road
London WC1X 8HB
United Kingdom

Re: MS: 213486655663594 BMI and dental caries in children and adolescents: a systematic review of the literature

Dear Drs Moher, Shekelle, and Stewart,

We appreciate the opportunity to resubmit our manuscript “Obesity and dental caries in children and adolescents: a systematic review of the literature” to your journal Systematic Reviews.

We are grateful to the reviewers for their very thoughtful suggestions on our earlier draft. We have addressed each of the reviewers’ concerns and include our response at the end of this document. We believe our manuscript is much improved as a result of this process and would like to extend our appreciation to you and to the reviewers. With their permission, we would like to acknowledge their valuable feedback on our earlier draft and have included this in our current manuscript.

We hope you find our review improved and of interest to your readers, and look forward to your response. Please do not hesitate to contact me if I can provide any further information.

With kindest regards,

Merrilyn Hooley
Response to Reviewers

1. Reviewer's report
Title: Obesity and dental caries in children and adolescents: a systematic review of the literature

Version: 1 Date: 1 February 2012
Reviewer: Francisco Vàzquez-Nava

Reviewer's report:
If you make the suggested corrections, reading the article will be easier

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

Declaration of competing interests:
I do not have competing interests

Title
Obesity and dental caries in children and adolescents: a systematic review of the literature.
This article is a review of the literature about:
1. the association between dental caries and obesity.
2. The obesogenic risk factors that are associated with the development of caries in children and adolescents.
3. the methodological limitations of the studies related with caries and obesity.
4. what may be valuable directions for future research.
The theme of this study is very interesting. However, the paper has a number of problems that reduce its ability to make a contribution to the scientific literature.

Abstract
Please check your objective, results and conclusion.
Objective you write obesity.
Results you write BMI no obesity, delete low BMI is not your objective. please Give us more information.
Conclusion; is there o no association between obesity and dental caries? please answer the research question.

➢ Thank you. We have removed our reference to ‘obesity’ within the objective and replaced with ‘BMI’. This hopefully addresses the other points raised.
Results
This section is very extensive and hard to read. I suggest that it should be revised and rewritten. Please do not describe all the tables.
Check page 10; paragraph of “Sample Description” ...............Mexico, Chile)) (France................................Turkey (2)), if it is necessary you can use ([..[..]

➢ Thank you, we have removed this information and made considerable changes to the Results section in an effort to improve clarity and readability.

Discussion
Beginning this section answering the principal research question (Objective in abstract): is there no association between obesity and dental caries in children and adolescents.
You insist, BMI vs obesity. Please use BMI or obesity

➢ We have broadened our objective to investigate the association between dental caries and BMI rather than obesity. We believe we have now clearly answered the objective and appreciate you identifying this flaw.

We thank you for your thoughtful review of, and feedback on, our paper. We hope that our revisions are satisfactory.

Vzauqez Nava Francisco PhD.

2. Reviewer's report
Title: Obesity and dental caries in children and adolescents: a systematic review of the literature

Version: 1 Date: 1 May 2012

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests.

Reviewer: Julie Eichenberger Gilmore

Reviewer's report:
Major Compulsory Revisions

1. page 3, para 1: multifactorial diseases that have impact on children's . . .
   
   ➢ Thank you; the change has been made

2. page 3, para 1: Please specify what development outcomes you are talking about.
   
   ➢ Psychosocial development; this information has been added

3. page 3, para 1: The link between the two conditions is striking and changes . .
   
   ➢ Thank you; the change has been made

4. page 3, para 1: It is necessary to clarify that BMI is being used as a surrogate for obesity and why that is appropriate.
   
   ➢ Thank you; we have included this information

5. page 5, para 1, line 2: The abstract states that papers published between 2004-2010 inclusive are included. This section states until June 2011. Please clarify.
   
   ➢ Thank you; the change has been made to the Abstract to indicate inclusion dates of 2004-2011.

6. page 5, para 2, line 4: It is not clear why you include two studies from Kantowitz' review since you earlier stated the purpose was to explore development since that review.
   
   ➢ We include a slight overlap with Kantowitz in including papers published between 2004-2011 and now acknowledge this

7. page 21: ISI and Cochrane are not indicated in Box 1 but they were mentioned in the Methods. Please indicate the date of the search.
   
   ➢ This information has been included
8. Figure 1: It is confusing that the 2 extra articles are described with the 41. Are they part of the 41 or are they extra?

   ➢ **In total, 41 papers were excluded. We have altered the wording to make this point clearer.**

Minor Essential Revisions

1. Abstract: Depending on the editor's guidelines, define abbreviations before first use, i.e., ISI, CINAHL.

   ➢ **Other papers published in this journal have used abbreviations for databases so we have retained. We have removed other abbreviations (e.g., BMI) from the abstract.**

2. I suggest rewriting the results sentence to more clearly summarize the findings. Avoid the use of "appears" and state your findings.

   ➢ **Thank you; the summary of results has been rewritten to improve clarity**

3. page 3, para 2, line 2: delete "only"

4. page 3, para 2, line 3: change "their" to "the" and delete "actually"

5. page 3, para 2, line 4: delete "only"

6. page 3, para 2, line 5: change "different" to "numerous"

7. page 4, line 3: it is not clear what you mean by "early BMI status"

8. page 4, line 6-7: I don't think the Google search statement adds anything to the manuscript and suggest deleting it.

9. page 7, para 2, line 6-7: Suggest "Five studies were undertaken as field examinations; and rated 3 [20,30,31,32] or 4 [14]."

Discretionary Revisions

1. page 7, para 1, line 3: cite the two studies that found dental caries were associated with both high and low BMI. They were hard to find by scanning the tables.

   ➢ **Thank you; all suggested changes have been made**

We thank you for your thoughtful review of, and feedback on our paper. We hope that our revisions are satisfactory.