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Dear Editor

I am sending a manuscript entitled:” Oral health conditions using IOTN, DMFT, CPI, OHI, PI in an Albanian adolescent population” that I would like to submit to Your consideration for publication on BMC Oral Health.

This paper describes a study on oral health conditions using five different indexes. The results show not good conditions of oral health in adolescents in Albania and suggest to start with preventive programmes to reduce oral pathologies.

The study was performed with the effective cooperation of private practices and the final results were used for the thesis in Master of Science in Dentistry. All the people involved in this study accepted the content and conclusions of the paper.

The manuscript was changed including line and page numbering, as you requested.

The written English was editing by Elisabetta Marino (official translator of Tor Vergata University).

The “Authors Contribution” section was clearly specified as you suggested.

Clinical data are available in a repository link in “Availability of supporting data” section.

The manuscript was modified as suggested by the reviewers:

Referee 2

1. the study of Marcenes et Al. (2013) was cited in the manuscript and included in references chapter

2. the explanations of each oral health indices were moved into method sanction

3. weighted analysis was considered less important than the other statistical results by our statistical expert

4. "50 per cent" in line 152 was corrected in "50 percent"

Referee 1

1. mean age and SD were added

2. comprised was changed in "included"
3. statistical findings (chi square and p value) were added and the list of indexes was moved in the result section

4. the first part of introduction was removed

5. the reference of oral hygiene index by Greene was inserted (Greene JC, Vermillion JR. The simplified oral hygiene index. Journal of American Dental Association 1964, 68:7-13)

6. results about the relationship between IOTN and other indexes were added as suggested by the reviewer citing the study "Borzabadi-Farahani A, Eslamipour F, Asgari I. Association between orthodontic treatment need and caries experience. Acta Odontol Scand. 2011;69(1):2-117", as indicated by the reviewer

7. results chapter was separated by discussions chapter

8. limitations of IOTN use were inserted citing the indicated study 15 (Borzabadi-Farahani A. A review of the evidence supporting the aesthetic orthodontic treatment need indices. Progress in Orthodontics 2012;13(3):304-13)

Responses to the concerns by the Editor

The paper was corrected by Dr. Elisabetta Marino, official English language translater of Tor Vergata University, Rome.

The methods section and the examination protocol were improved describing how the clinical examination was carried on.

The following points were modified as suggested by the Editor:

1. Descriptive data were reported to one decimal place in the manuscript and in all the tables too.

2. In the abstract P=0.0000 was changed and reported as P<0.0001. All the decimal places were removed.

3. The chi-square test was reported with the symbol \( \chi^2 \) and in the methods ensure as “chi-square”.

4. In the abstract CPI was clearly explained (Community Periodontal Index).

5. The term “radiograms” was replaced with “radiographs”.

6. In the Methods section clinical examination was described using more details. The abbreviated forms of the indices were used, because they were already described in the abstract. The examiner training and reliability was reported more accurately.
7. Details about the DMFT were initially included in the introduction but one of the reviewer asked us to move them in the introduction section. We measured DMFT according to WHO guidelines (1997) and it was specified in the manuscript.

8. Each examiner visited the students randomly and it was specified in the manuscript.

9. The Results section was modified as the Editor requested.

10. The section about the relationship between IOTN and indices was explained in a different way.

11. The Results section was changed, some data were removed and some others were described.

12. Tables were changed as indicate and we need them all.

13. “Discussions” was modified in “Discussion”.

14. A short paragraph on the important findings of the study was added prior to discussing their significance.

15. Paragraph two was modified.

16. A new paragraph about the limitations of using IOTN in our study was added.

17. Conclusions section was changed.

I should like to know, at your convenience, whether it can be accepted for publication on your journal.

With kind regards

Your sincerely

Giuseppina Laganà