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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses one or several testable research questions? (Brief or other article types: is there a clear objective?)
Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?
Yes - the approach is appropriate

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with sufficient technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?
Yes - experiments and analyses were performed appropriately

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?
No - there are issues with the statistics in the study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?
Yes - the author's interpretation is reasonable

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? If not, can further revisions be made to make the work technically sound?
Probably - with minor revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: Dear editor,
Once again, thank you for the invitation to review the manuscript "Association between malocclusion, caries and oral hygiene in children 6 to 12 years old resident in sub-urban Nigeria". Several concerns were raised in my previous peer review, which were mostly answered. Overall, the quality of the manuscript increased significantly. However, a few issues were still raised.
The authors did not reflect their responses in the manuscript itself. I had look it for it.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:
Thank you for the effort in answering my queries. Overall, the quality of the manuscript increased significantly, but two issues were still raised.

Methods
In the manuscript, authors wrote: "Statistical significance was inferred at p < 0.05." However, in their response letter, they wrote: "The level of significance used was p < 0.05." Please align.

Results
The use of flowchart/flow diagram is recommended to several studies design, including cross-sectional (STROBE checklist - item 13c) and randomized clinical trials, not only systematic review. The flow of the participants must be clearly demonstrated for the readers. Please see the examples of the flowchart of the following cross-sectional studies: Stoffel LMB, Muniz FWMG, Colussi PRG, Rösing CK, Colussi EL. Nutritional assessment and associated factors in the elderly: apopulation-based cross-sectional study. Nutrition. 2018 Nov;55-56:104-110. AND Haas AN, Prado R, Rios FS, Costa RDSA, Angst PDM, Moura MDS, Maltz M, Jardim JJ. Occurrence and predictors of gingivitis and supragingival calculus in a population of Brazilian adults. Braz Oral Res. 2019 May 27;33:e036.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:
Thank you for the effort in answering my queries. Overall, the quality of the manuscript increased significantly, but two issues were still raised.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

This reviewer has been recruited by a partner organization, Research Square. Reviewers with declared or apparent competing interests are not utilized for these reviews. This reviewer has agreed to publication of their comments online under a Creative Commons Attribution License attributed to Research Square and was paid a small honorarium for completing the review within a specified timeframe. Honoraria for reviews such as this are paid regardless of the reviewer recommendation.
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