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Dear Lisa Heaton, dear Reviewers,

Thank you very much for giving us the opportunity to submit a revised version of our manuscript. Special thanks to the reviewers for their helpful advises.

We are pleased to submit a revised copy of the original research article entitled “Psychological distress and anxiety compared amongst dental patients- results of a cross-sectional study in 1549 adults” for consideration for publication in BMC Oral Health.

All remarks have been corrected as mentioned. The revised manuscript uploaded is clean, track changes or highlighting are not visible.

As “Supplementary Material” a version of the document with visible track changes were uploaded to facilitate the review and decision process. This file is not for publication.

Reviewer #1: Review of manuscript OHEA-D-18-00226R1

Abstract: Result should be concise and important finding should be written.

The abstract (p 2) has been rewritten to be more concise and only contain important information.
Keywords: Check Mesh representation.

Keywords (p 3, line 54 to 62) have been updated and adapted towards Medical Subject Headings.

Background: Finding of any study should be written in the discussion part.
Study mentioned as been moved to the Discussion part (Line 254) and integrated into the Discussion.

Methods: The reliability and validity of questioners has been checked.

The reliability and validity of the BSI-18 can be found in line 141-142 and of the DAS in line 154. Additionally, we now included the Cronbachs α of BSI-18 (line 143) and DAS (155) from our sample group, which proves a good internal consistency.

Did Consent was obtained from the participants

Patients had to give written informed consent to participate in our study. This information has been added to the manuscript in lines 121-122.

Discussion: The finding of the results should be compared with the recent research articles

Recent studies have been added to the list of References and in line 224.

Reviewer #2: Review of manuscript OHEA-D-18-00226R1

There is a need for language correction. Dental exam should be written as dental examination. The incorrect use of preposition as well as an incomplete sentence should be corrected.

Several language corrections have been done.
Materials and Methods:

I don’t seem to understand the rationale for grouping the patient to less than 46 and more than 46. This grouping has a potential of masking the different possible anxiety levels in different age categories.

This grouping has been chosen due to the average age being 45.68 years. A line clarifying this was added to line 170-171.

Discussion:

Authors believe that women have a higher chance of developing dental anxiety but proffer no reason why.

An explanation may be the higher levels of neuroticism in women and it is correlating with anxiety development. However, we were expecting this due to similar studies findings [29]. Improvements have been made in lines 247-250.

This manuscript has not been published yet and is not under consideration for publication elsewhere. We have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

Thank you for your helpful and productive suggestions on our study. We hope to have answered and corrected any remarks to your complete satisfaction.

Sincerely,

Alexander Zinke, Christian Hannig, Hendrik Berth