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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

Thank you very much for your comments. We have attempted to take your final remarks into account in the revised version of our manuscript. Our responses are provided below.

1. When reporting the odds ratio, please report as (OR: 3.06; 95% CI: 1.40-6.70). Note the punctuation. Please revise throughout the manuscript.

The odds ratio were quoted as recommended throughout the manuscript (lines 46-50, lines 217-221).

2. Please for the table 4: Please remove the columns reporting B, SE, Wald, df and exp(B). Next, report levels of significance as 0.001 (put a 0 before the dot). Report the odds ratio. The methodology states that all variables with 0.25 enters the model. However, there are a number of variables with values higher than 0.25 not in the model. Please improve the reporting of the table 4.

The columns reporting B, SE, Wald and df were removed. The column exp(B) was renamed Odds Ratio. The levels of significance were modified as required.

The 20 independent variables with a p value less than 0.25 in the univariate analyses were entered into the logistic model. Fourteen of them were removed by the model (“variables not in the equation”) and the other six remained into the final equation and were ranked (“variables in the equation”).
I provided in the former revised manuscript the results given by the SPSS software but I think it is really difficult to understand for the readers. I suggest to put in table 4 the last equation, with the six independent variables as ranked by the model, and to list in the caption the 14 independent variables that were excluded by the model.

Lines 462-465: Table caption: “In the final equation, six independent variables remained and were ranked whereas fourteen were excluded: mother’s profession, father’s profession, part-time job, at least 3 main meals per day, no daily soft drink consumption, water consumption when thirsty, daily candy consumption, daily sugar free chewing gum consumption, daily smoking, drug consumption, flossing, presence of dental crowding, periodontal disease even mild, presence of restorative care.”