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Reviewer's report:

Dear Editor,

I have reviewed the manuscript "PUBH-D-16-02790R1". The rationale of study is interesting and needs testing. I have listed my specific recommendations and comments below.

* The introduction section can be shortened to focus on a specific subject, such as the role of obesity in oral pathologies or vice versa.

* Study hypothesis is assertive and very complicated researchers may revise it to concentrate on a specific topic. Obesity, consumption of certain foods and drinks, and masticatory function may be unique or combined reasons of obesity. Then discriminative evaluation may be very difficult or not rationale.

* The description of pre-teen may include children aged 12 years but it is a squeezed period that does not cover pre-teen period.

* Asymetric classification for BMI (-2SD ≤BMI≤ ………1SD< BMI≤ 2SD) needs eplanation. Rationale should be explained.

* Inter-observer coefficient of variation is needed to rely on the homogeneity of observance.

* Risk for metabolic syndrome can be assessed by using several factors; at least by using waist circumference rather than WtHr<0.5.

* Use of sweet drinks needs explanation; frequency, quantity, and type may change the way of significant association.
In discussion section researchers seem to be concentrated on information about their hypothesis rather than reasoning to their results and then comment on similarity or dissimilarities in other studies.

In conclusion I can recommend revision in hypothesis, revising methods section according to above mentioned statements.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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