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Reviewer’s report:

Minor comments:
The authors’ responded majority of the comments but some additional revision is still needed. Please find additional comments below.

1) There is still punctuation and grammatical errors throughout the text. (e.g. brackets, abbreviations).

2) In abstract section page 2 line 39-40-41: the sentence may better read as: ‘Gingivitis was defined as the presence of gingival bleeding upon gentle probing (BoP) in at least one site and the extent of the problem was classified according to the percentage of teeth whose gingiva presented BoP (limited: 25-49% of the teeth tested; extensive: >50% of teeth tested).

3) In the abstract section line 46-47: please add the value for Urban-public schoolchildren as well.

4) In abstract section, line 34-35: please also add 'health regions' into the brackets.

5) Please revise % used before the number or any abbreviation and please revise as: BOP% (e.g. in the abstract and page 10 line 215).

6) Please be consistent regarding the sub-gingival or subgingival throughout the text.

7) Please do not abbreviate dental calculus as DC.

8) U.S. or US please select and use same.

9) Page 7, line 149: please revise as 'soft tissue examinations'.

10)Page 7, line 150: please use abbreviation BOP.

11)Page 9 and 10, line 202-208: please eliminate repetition.

12)Rural/public or rural-public? Please use same style in both tables and the text.
13) Page 11, line 234-245: please add the values as percentages.

14) In the results section, 'Bleeding on probing' part includes some repetitions from the previous part please revise or combine them.

15) In the discussion part, no need to repeat the aim of the study in here (Line 266-269).

16) 'This is because the most appropriate method for dental plaque detection involves the use of a disclosing solution….' Please add citation to this statement because the other used plaque recording methods are still valid in order to evaluate plaque levels of the study populations.

17) In the discussion and the conclusion sections still repetitions exist, please revise these parts by eliminating them.

18) Please add the partial-mouth examination as a limitation of the study and discuss the high number of teeth that were not evaluated (On average, 0.68 teeth, more than half!).

19) In the discussion section, line 287: Oral hygiene performance including tooth brushing and flossing prior to the clinical examination may also underestimate the clinical situation by removing the dental plaque and reducing the bleeding.

20) If the authors collected the data for dietary habits why did they not present this data briefly? In that case their assumption on dietary habits shown below was supported by data. 'This BoP variation could arise from differences in oral hygiene and dietary habits, education, health promotion dissemination, and SES that need to be explored further.'
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