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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editors and Reviewers:

Thank you for your letter and for the reviewers’ comments concerning our manuscript entitled “Circulating leptin and adiponectin in patients with periodontitis: A systematic review and meta-analysis”. Those comments are very instrumental for revising and improving our paper. The revised manuscript has been uploaded. The main corrections in the paper and the replies to the reviewer’s comments are as flowing.

Review 1:

1. First of all, the title of the manuscript does not completely reflect the research question/ PICO, as the main objective is not to assess the levels of adipokines in patients with periodontitis but to compare the levels between the two study groups.

Replies: We investigated two focused questions in present study. Therefore only involving one question /PICO in the title is not comprehensive enough. However it is too much to include both
of the PICO in the title. Hence we changed the title to a more appropriate vision: Association of circulating leptin and adiponectin with periodontitis: A systematic review and meta-analysis

2. Second, although the authors have done an extensive literature review about the topic, it is imperative to precisely state the clinical or public health significance of monitoring the leptin/adiponectin among healthy and unhealthy patients. For instance, estimating adipokines profile may allow clinicians to predict the susceptibility to the disease

Replies: The clinical significance of our findings has been added in the conclusion section (paragraph 2, Page 19).

3. Third, information on the inclusion/exclusion of non-English literature, gray literature or unpublished/older data (date restrictions-from which date) is missing under the reporting characteristics, which might have led to reporting bias.

Replies: We did not find any non-English literature in the search. The publication bias indicated the presence of the gray (unpublished) manuscripts, which is mentioned in the discussion section (Paragraph 1, Page 19).

4. Fourth, nothing is mentioned about the assumptions made or approaches adopted, to deal with the missing/unclear data from primary studies. Additionally, illustrative plots (Figure 2, Figure 3 and Figure 4) are ambiguous and unclear to assess them. If possible include sample size with forest plots. More importantly, findings of the present study can be analysed only in the view of its other potential limitations such as (a) methodological diversity in estimating periodontal disease and cytokine levels, (b) extracted studies had both adjusted and unadjusted data (c) quality of individual study & (d) sample size variability, all of which definitely questions the validity of study.

Replies: The studies with either missing/unclear data or improper publication formats (Abstract) were excluded, which might lead to some limitations. These are described in the discussion section (paragraph 3, Page 18). The illustrative plots of Figure 2, Figure 3 and Figure 4 are rewritten (Page 29-31). The sample size is provided in Table 2. The limitation (a)-(d) is added in the discussion section(Paragraph 1, Page 19).

Review 2

The revisions to the comments of Review 2 were conducted according to the attached file (OHEA-D-17-00022 2), and the replies have been included in the attachment file (OHEA-D-17-00022 2 replied) which has been uploaded together.