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

Paper: MS: 9042217981469167
Title: The impact of oral health conditions, socioeconomic status and use of specific substances on quality of life of addicted persons

We are resubmitting the referred manuscript to the BMC Oral Health. We have revised it according to the suggestions of editorial request and reviewers #1 and #2. The corrections inside the manuscript are in red color.

Editorial request:
1. Please move tables after references.
Response: Thank you for your suggestion.

2. Please include Acknowledgement section. By way of a section ?Acknowledgements?, please acknowledge anyone who contributed towards the article by making substantial contributions to conception, design, acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data, or who was involved in drafting the manuscript or revising it critically for important intellectual content, but who does not meet the criteria for authorship. Please also include the source(s) of funding for each author, and for the manuscript preparation. Authors must describe the role of the funding body, if any, in design, in the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data; in the writing of the manuscript; and in the decision to submit the manuscript for publication. Please also acknowledge anyone who contributed materials essential for the study. If a language editor has made significant revision of the manuscript, we recommend that you acknowledge the editor by name, where possible. The role of a scientific (medical) writer must be included in the acknowledgements section, including their source(s) of funding. We suggest wording such as 'We thank Jane Doe who provided medical writing services on behalf of XYZ Pharmaceuticals Ltd.' Authors should obtain permission to acknowledge from all those mentioned in the Acknowledgements section.
Response: The comment was take into consideration and alterations was made in the manuscript. (Acknowledgement)

Comments of Reviewer #1:

Reviewer's report
Title: Title:The impact of oral health conditions, socioeconomic status and use of specific substances on quality of life of addicted persons
Version: 4 Date: 19 December 2014
Reviewer: Reviewer: Raquel P Antoniazzi

Reviewer’s report:
1. Major Compulsory Revisions

1.1. Methods: Please, provide information on how the questionnaires were completed (in a quiet room; mode of administration, if it was face to face interview, and so on).

Response: The comment was take into consideration and alterations was made in the manuscript.
“The questionnaires were completed in a quiet room and the face-to-face interviews were conducted.”

1.2. Results: Provide the response-rate and the reasons for non-response. It would be interesting to include a flow diagram.

Response: The comments were taken into consideration and alterations were made in the manuscript (Results section).

1.3. Results: I suggest the inclusion of a table with data for the mean scores of the WHOQOL-BREF and the physical, psychological, social relationships and environment domains.

Response: The comments were taken into consideration and alterations were made in the manuscript (Results section). This way, was included the table for the mean scores of the WHOQOL-BREF and the physical, psychological, social relationships and environment domains.

2. Minor Essential Revisions:

2.1. Abstract: Methods: line 47: Correct "level of significance ## <#0.05" with "level of significance # <0.05."

Response: The comments were taken into consideration and alterations were made in the manuscript (Abstract).

2.2. Abstract: Methods: line 48: There are two confidence interval values, "income (OR=2.41; CI 95%= 1.15-3.59 1.22-4.77)." Please correct it.

Response: The comments were taken into consideration and alterations were made in the manuscript (Abstract).

2.3. Introduction: Page 4, line 97: I suggest removing the term "development of cirrhosis" of the sentence, because it is redundant: “high risk of diseases such as HIV, Hepatitis, Tuberculosis, cirrhosis and development of cirrhosis [4-7]."

Response: Considering the comments of the reviewer, the authors chose to exclude these information and alterations were made in the manuscript.
2.4. Introduction: line 105: The term "gum disease" should be replaced by "periodontal disease".
Response: Considering the comments of the reviewer, the authors chose to replace these information and alterations were made in the manuscript.

2.5. Methods: Explain why the sample size calculation was performed with dental caries data, since the study outcome is quality of life?
In fact the calculation of the sample was carried out to a high power test for the association between oral health and socioeconomic variables, and use of specific substances on quality of life of addicted persons ("When calculating the sample, the power of test of at least 80% with significance level of 5% and minimum significant odds ratio of 1.5 in association with the variables were taken into account"). However the authors also bother to get a good estimative for prevalence of low quality of life ("To calculate the probability sample, we considered the situation of higher probability of sampling error (p = 0.50) assuming a confidence level of 95% and a sampling error of 5%") and DMF ("We Considered an overall mean number of decayed, missing and filled teeth (DMFT index) of 14.88 with a standard deviation of 6:38 [27]").

2.6. Methods: Questionnaires: line 151: The data of oral hygiene and dental treatment were not used in the study, and may be removed, as follows: "Data were collected on the participant’s sex, age, race, and socioeconomic status (monthly family income, participant’s and parents' educational level).
Response: Considering the comments of the reviewer, the authors chose to remove these information and alterations were made in the manuscript.

2.6. Methods: Outcome measure: The WHOQOL-bref, consists of 26 questions, two general issues of quality of life and the other 24 represent each of the 24 facets that make up the original instrument. On page 6, line 163 contained 28 items. Please clarify with a better explanation on the manuscript.
Response: The comments were taken into consideration and alterations were made in the manuscript (Outcome measure).

2.7. Methods: Statistical analyses: would be interesting additional details about the criteria used to dichotomized outcome quality of life.
Response: The comments were taken into consideration and alterations were made in the manuscript (Methods).

2.8. Methods: Statistical analyses: Please includes the analysis of the chi-square, as described above abstract.
Response: Thank you for your suggestion. These information are on table 2 crude analysis (p-value).

2.9. Results: Table 2: The table should be better structured and configured. The values of "p" should be standardized with 3 units after point and all with point. There are some with a comma. Likewise, the "OR" and percent should be standardized into two units after the point.
Response: The comments were taken into consideration and alterations were made in the manuscript (Table2).

2.10. Discussion: page 10: When the WHOQOL-BREF questionnaire was discussed, I think it should be mentioned that there is a tool to assess quality of life in drug users, but not yet validated in Brazil (Drug User Quality of Life Scale:DUQOL).
Response: The comments were taken into consideration and alterations were made in the manuscript (Discussion).

Comments of Reviewer #2:

Reviewer's report
Title: The impact of oral health conditions, socioeconomic status and use of specific substances on quality of life of addicted persons
Version: 4Date:11 December 2014
Reviewer: chaiana CP Piovesan

INTRODUCTION:
Although the introduction is well written and contemplate important issues, the authors no reported in the introduction if there are studies that evaluate the association between socioeconomic factors and quality of life in a similar.
Response: The comments were taken into consideration and alterations were made in the manuscript (Introduction).

METHODS
- I thing that the state of São Paulo has many cities and many multidisciplinary outpatient public clinics. Why only three clinics were selected? How was the selection process of cities and clinics? How many patients had at each clinic? How many clinics there are in each city?
- In second paragraph of Methods the authors report “representative sample of adults”. Why is representative? Is not a convenience sample?
- What the population of three cities?
Response: The State of São Paulo consists of 645 municipalities, 15 Administrative Regions of government and 17 Regional Health Centers - (DRS). The DRS of Piracicaba was selected and this consists of four health boards, which are: Macaws, Limeira, Piracicaba and Rio Claro. The cities covered by CAPS-AD are Limeira, Piracicaba and
Rio Claro. The comments were taken into consideration and alterations were made in the manuscript (Methods).

Clinical examination
- I suggested that the authors describe the kappa values in the first paragraph of results, and not in methods.
  Response: The comments were taken into consideration and alterations were made in the manuscript (Results).

Statistical analysis
- Multilevel analysis is more appropriate for this study. The author would perform the multilevel regression analysis considering the clinic where each patient is treated as second level. Moreover, the mean income of the city where the clinic is located can be used as contextual variable for adjust too. The multilevel model permits the simultaneous examination of the effects of contextual and individual predictors on an outcome.
  Response: Thanks for the considerations, however is not justified in this case the multilevel analysis as users of CAPS ad does not necessarily reside in that city, that the most correct way is to evaluate the income and other socioeconomic variables as an individual predictor and not contextual.

- Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
  Response: Thank you for your suggestion.

- Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
  Response: Thank you for your suggestion.

The authors are so grateful for the useful remarks and suggestions. They will surely improve our manuscript. We are looking forward to having this revised manuscript reconsidered for publication in the BMC Oral Health.

Yours Sincerely

Tais Cristina Nascimento Marques