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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editors,

We thank you again for your comments our manuscript originally entitled "Validation of a new version of the Spanish Geriatric Oral Health Assessment Index (GOHAI-SP) for older people" submitted to BMC Oral Health.

We especially thank the suggestions of the reviewers. We do think that they have substantially improved our article.

We have attended all the final comments, and we hope that it will be finally published in your journal.

Please find below the final clean version of the manuscript and the point by point response to the reviewers.

ANSWERS TO THE EDITORS

1. Please address the final reviewers' comments found at the end of this email.

Answer: We have carefully read the comments, and we have answered them.
2. Please confirm whether informed consent, written or verbal, was obtained from all participants and clearly state this in your Ethics approval and consent to participate section. If verbal, please state the reason and whether the ethics committee approved this procedure.

A: We have included a statement that clearly says that all participants provided written informed consent (line 343, page 14).

3. Consent for publication refers to consent for the publication of identifying images or other personal or clinical details of participants that compromise anonymity. If your manuscript uses identifying images or other personal/clinical details, please include a statement of consent to publish from the patient, or in the case of minors, the patients’ guardians. If this is not applicable to your manuscript, please state “Not Applicable” in this section.

A: We have included the “Not Applicable” state (line 349, page 15).

4. At this stage, please upload your manuscript as a single, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colours. All relevant tables/figures/additional files should also be clean versions. Figures (and additional files) should remain uploaded as separate files.

A: We provide the clean and corrected version of the manuscript.

ANSWERS TO THE REVIEWERS REPORTS:

Asja Celebic (Reviewer 1):

Some minor English language corrections are necessary

A: We have made a new language review with a professional scientist translator.

Mario Brondani (Reviewer 2):

The authors did a good job in addressing the reviewers' comments, questions and suggestions.

A: We sincerely thank your comments.

Not further revisions needed with the exception of language: that is, make sure the manuscript has been read by an editor/reviewer whose first language is English.

A: We have made a new language review with a professional scientist translator.
Mariana Campomar Seoane, PhD (Reviewer 3): General comments

1. The work has been enhanced after modifications.

2. Some aspects of this research topic remain for discussion, because it is a research area that admit it. I think "a modified version…" is the most appropriate way to describe what the authors did in this research. Nevertheless, it could admit debate … which is good in the sphere of promoting new knowledge.

3. There is a more precisely explanation of the original instrument and its dimensions.

4. Methodology has become more comprehensibly, since it is clear the role of each participant (FC and random sample).

5. Discussion and conclusion are appropriate.

A: we sincerely thank all your comments.