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Manuscript Title: Dentists’ Attitudes Towards Chairside Medical Conditions Screening in a Dental Setting: A Pilot Study in Saudi Arabia

Manuscript ID: Revision OHEA-D-18-00555

Thank you for the constructive comments of the reviewers. We have addressed the comments in this revised manuscript and the paper has undergone further English editing. Please note that responses to first author highlighted in Yellow and for second author in Green.

Reviewer 1 Prof. Maha El Tantawi
The manuscript reports on a pilot study assessing Saudi dentists' attitudes to screen for medical conditions. As the authors suggested, this would help address the increasing burden due to NCDs. There are some comments in the attached file- mostly related to the need to clarify, add or remove parts of the manuscript...

Abstract
Comment 1 (Line 24, Page 3): Pls report % of those willing or mean (SD) .... here and in the remaining part of Abstract.
Answer: Thank you for your comment. In fact, the percentages are important for showing the response distribution among the respondents versus the mean ranks for the ANOVA to assess relative importance of the items within a question. Therefore, we opted to keep both the percentages and mean rank in the abstract and the rest of the manuscript.

Introduction
Comment 1 (Line 1, Page 4): Pls check if this "age 70" is correctly placed here...sth seems to be missing.
Answer: Thank you for pointing out this typo. It is corrected in this revised manuscript to ‘16 million people die prematurely aged 70-years-old’ (Line 5-7, Page 3).

Comment 2 (Line 7, Page 4): Pls explain whether this is a global goal or related to Saudi Arabia and provide a ref.
Answer: This is a global goal including Saudi Arabia. The word global has been added with the reference [1] in this revised manuscript (Line 11-13, Page 3).

Comment 3 (Line 25, Page 4): Pls check this term. I am not sure how health care professionals can be incorporated across disciplines!!
Answer: The sentence ‘health care professionals can be incorporated’ has been removed and the sentences has been rephrased in this revised manuscript (Line 25-27, Page 3).

Comment 4 & 5 (line 54, 55, Page 4): What does this mean?
Both DBP and RBG are spelled out in this revised manuscript. Both stand for diastolic blood pressure and random blood glucose (Line 54-57, Page 3).

Comment 6 (line 24, 25, Page 5): Pls check grammar and punctuation
Answer: Grammar, punctuation and the whole sentence was re-edited in this revised manuscript (Line 32-38, Page 4).

Materials and Methods
Comment 7 (Line 59, Page 6): Pls add that it is a convenience sample
Answer: We have mentioned in the first sentence of the paragraph that it was a convenience sample, please see Line 6 Page 5 of this revised manuscript.

Comment 8 (Line 5, Page 7): Pls report mean (SD) and/ or median, even if non parametric tests are used OR provide a ref to indicate that it is mandatory to report the mean ranks/s
Answer: Friedman test is a non-parametric test to look at difference in mean ranks of items within a question.
Please check this link. https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/polopoly_fs/1.714575!/file/step-marshall-FriedmanS.pdf

Comment 9 (Line 17, Page 7): I think you mean the "parametric" NOT "conventional" ANOVA
Answer: we replaced the word conventional with parametric as instructed by the reviewer (Line 15, Page 6).
Comment 10 (Line 17-25, Page 7): Pls remove the part in lines 17-25 which reports on analysis not used. It is confusing to describe methods that was not eventually done and not needed.
Answer: Thank you for your input. This part has been removed from the statistical analysis section and discussion in this revised manuscript.

Comment 11 (subheading, Page 8): I am not sure if the journal style allows numbering Results items or if it is needed.
Answer: Thank you for pointing out this error. Numbering of the whole headings has been removed from the whole sections including results.

Comment 12 (Page 8) Pls remove the pattern from the bars so the labels (values) can be seen more clearly. Pls use a bigger font for the figure elements.
Answer: The pattern from the bars is removed and a bigger font is used in this revised manuscript, Page 7 and attached the amended Figure 1 as a separate file.

Comment 13 (Line 22, Page 10): Pls remove the 5 columns showing the % selecting each option, the mean (SD)/ median - to be calculated, would be enough. These % increase the amount of information displayed in the table but add nothing beyond what the mean (SD) say.
Answer: As mentioned in response to comment 1 (Abstract), the percentages are important for showing the response distribution among the respondents versus the mean ranks for the ANOVA to assess relative importance of the items within the questions.

Discussion

Comment 14 (line 8, Page 12): Pls briefly mention where these studies were conducted and give a general time reference to them like if they were recent or old.....Pls do that here and all through the Disc. It d be helpful to readers if some context (brief description of compared studies) is given.
Answer: Place and time of these studies has been reported in this revised manuscript, (e.g. Line 14-16, Page 11)

Comment 15 (Line 18, Page 12): Pls do not repeat Results; a brief mention of the direction/ highlights of Results without repeating the %s should be enough.
Answer: We thank the reviewer for her input. The % have been deleted from this revised manuscript.

Comment 16 (line 41& 42, Page 12): Pls remove this part. Generating prevalence estimates is not an aim of chairside screening. I think the primary objective in this case is referral.
Answer: Thank you for your input. This part has been removed from this revised manuscript.

Comment 17 (line 47, Page 12): Pls correct the typo
Answer: The whole sentence has been removed from this revised manuscript.

Comment 18 (Line 7, Page 13): Pls explain which causality is meant? the authors neither identified outcome and exposure nor conducted any analysis to associate factors together. It is a simple
Comment 19 (Line9-15, Page 13): Pls explain how the external validity of the study is affected by the impossibility of investigating the relationship between these variables. Usually, external validity is affected by the sample representativeness of the target population.
Answer: Many thanks for raising this error. This part has been removed from the revised manuscript.

Reviewer 2 Dr Arheiam Arheiam
This paper investigated attitudes and barrier to medical screening among a group of dentists in Saudi Arabia. Although authors indicated that the study is a pilot survey for a feasibility reasons, this was not addressed in the discussion! (1) In fact the study is a small survey among a convenience sample. Therefore, the authors should amend the title and (2) acknowledge the limitations of such small sample size and a non-representative sample and (3) tell us why they did not conduct a wider survey. (4) The manuscript still needs proof reading and (5) references to be added in places ( for example: Line 15: (The current data for SA is alarming,…)).

Answers:
(1) The word pilot has been deleted from the title and the text of this revised manuscript and replaced with an exploratory cross sectional study in the title and text of this revised manuscript. The limitation of the small sample has been added in the discussion (Line 9, Page 12).
(2) The non-representative of the sample has been acknowledged (Line 9-10, Page 12).
(3) Financial and administrative constraints were the barriers for not conducting a wide survey.
(4) This revised manuscript has undergone further English editing.
(5) The reference (The current data for SA is alarming,….) has been added (Line 21., Page 3).