Author’s response to reviews

Title: Evaluation of oral care protocols practice by dentists in Rio de Janeiro towards HIV/AIDS individuals

Authors:

Carina Silva-Boghossian (carinabogho@unigranrio.edu.br)
Brenda Boscardini (brenda_azzariti@hotmail.com)
Claudia Pereira (claudemarie_br@unigranrio.edu.br)
Edson Moreira (edsonjorge@unigranrio.edu.br)

Version: 1 Date: 20 Dec 2019

Author’s response to reviews:

Dec-20-2019
To Editor of BMC Oral Health

Dear Editor,

We would like to thank the reviewers for their most appreciated comments/criticism on the manuscript "Evaluation of oral care protocols practice by professionals towards HIV/AIDS individuals" (OHEA-D-19-00758). We have made the corrections and the modifications required by the reviewers and they are listed below respectively to comments made by the reviewers. I would also like to call your attention to the new title “Evaluation of oral care protocols practice by dentists in Rio de Janeiro towards HIV/AIDS individuals”, which was changed accordingly to the suggestion made by Reviewer 2.

Best regards,
Carina M. Silva-Boghossian

Response to Reviewer 1
1. Under Abstract page 2 line 10, the statement as highlighted in yellow needs to be corrected.
Answer: it was modified as requested to “more than 80% of them”.

2. Under Result page 5 lines 23 and 24, the statement as highlighted in yellow needs to be corrected.
Answer: the statement was rephrased as “The majority have also said that dental professionals can be intermediate in the transmission of HIV (83.3% of women and 88.8% of men).”

3. Under Discussion page 7, line 8, the statement as highlighted in yellow needs to be corrected.
Answer: We apologize to the Reviewer for that, as it was a typing error. Then it was corrected to “and”.

Response to Reviewer 2
4. The sample was stratified by gender and this was not mentioned in the aim of the study, it should be added.
Answer: We thank the reviewer for his/ her observation. That information was added to Abstract.

5. There is a need to mention "what's in not known" or what's missing in the literature about the research topic so that to justify the need to conduct this study, and this should be located at the end of the background, before the aim part
Answer: Authors agree with the reviewer. Then the following sentence was added just before the Aim of the study: “Currently, there is no available information on dentists from Rio de Janeiro State on their knowledge on the care of individuals living with HIV/ AIDS. “

6. The title as well as the aim of the study should include more description of your study population, like dental surgeons in Rio de Janeiro
Answer: That information was included in Title and Abstract.

7. No need for informed consent (page 4, line 13) returning the questionnaire is already considered an informed consent.
Answer: The statement “Informed consent was obtained from all participants” was excluded.

8. Presenting the results of other studies should be mentioned in the background part, only the comparison of the present study with the other should be done in the discussion but without listing the details of the previous studies' results because these should be already mentioned in the background (example page 7, lines 13 to 17).
Answer: Authors agree with the reviewer and a revision of the passage (page 7, lines 13 to 17) was performed by cutting non-necessary information.

In the results:
9. page 5-line 15: the word "men" is missing after the percentage.
Answer: it was corrected to “60% of men”.

10. page 6-lines 10 and 11: sentence need to be restructured, percentages can be represented at the end between brackets.
Answer: that sentence was rephrased to “Most respondents answered “No” to the question "Now, is AIDS the most important health problem in the world?" (75% of women and 69.8% of men)".