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Author’s response to reviews:

Comment 1 Why French and no other language was selected? (page 6)
Response to comment 1 For pragmatic reasons (available resources), only English and French language publications have been considered for full text analysis in this scoping review. However, we found 2 relevant publications in Portuguese in our manual reference searching, that have been consulted by means of translations and that we have mentioned previously in the discussion sections: 1. Silva de Souza T, Roncalli, AG. Oral health in the Brazilian Family Health Program: a health care model evaluation. Cad Saúde Pública. 2007;23 (11):2727-39. 2. Guerra Aquilante A, Gurgel Aciole G. Building a “Smiling Brazil”? Implementation of the Brazilian National Oral Health Policy in a health region in the State of São Paulo. Cad Saúde Pública. 2015;31 (1):82-96. Furthermore, we have now addressed this issue by adding a statement regarding limitation in the discussion see page 13 highlighted areas.

Comment 2 Didn’t quite understand how consultation with stakeholders was undertaken. Were they physically approached? Patient representatives – Who are they? Please clarify (page 7)
Response to comment 2: We have now clarified this issue by adding some more information to the text (see page 7). Please note that the acknowledgment section and list of authors contains the name of stakeholders in the present and our previous publication (Harnagea H et al. Barriers and facilitators in the integration of oral health into primary care: a scoping review. BMJ Open, 2017;7:e016078. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2017-016078)

Comment 3 This section in its current format looks like discussions rather than results. Please rewrite. (page 8)
Response to comment 3: We have now reformulated this section (see page 8 highlighted areas).

Comment 4 Section too long. Please condensate (page 10)
Response to comment 4: This section has been shortened now.

Comment 5 Define acronym and add to abbreviation list.
Response to comment 5: This instruction is included.
We have now defined the acronym PRISMA as Program of Research to Integrate the Services for the Maintenance of Autonomy and added it to the abbreviation list. Comment 6 Nor find in the abbreviation list. Response to comment 6 We have now added the Brazilian National Oral Health Policy (PNSB) in the abbreviation list. Comment 7 The closing part of the discussion and the conclusion need to be stronger than this. For example, in the conclusion need to add a statement about the validity of the assessed papers and a summary of their findings. Response to comment 7 Thank you for the comment. We have now modified this section and added some information in regard to the limitation of the scoping review in comparison to a systematic review (see pages 13-14 highlighted areas).