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Reviewer’s report:

1. The Background and introduction to this review is disjointed and unclear. For example line 79-82 are two sentences which are stand alone and do not actually tell the reader anything in terms of the broader picture and story of dental caries and obesity. I am unsure why there is a Background and Introduction heading. The information in regards to the umbrella review methodology in the 'Introduction' section would be better placed in the methods section. There are desired outcomes, research questions and then additional research questions in line 138-142. A clearer aim and objectives would make the paper easier to understand.

2. Study characteristics: what observational study designs within SRs and meta-analysis will you accept in the review. Please provide examples.

3. You appear to be using the JBI methodology for the umbrella review (ref 34) yet the protocol doesn't appear to follow this format. For example are you using the PICo format from reference 34? You currently have a citation for the ROBIS tool explaining the PICO equivalents (ref 41).

4. Please make sure your protocol aligns with your review methodology at this stage the headings and information within them do not. Also please check to ensure your refs match your sentences.

5. Your PICo equivalents are the research questions you are interested in they haven't been expressed as population, exposure or comparator or outcome. Please be clearer about what these are. Table 1 actually provides this information clearly.

6. Review characteristics: you have restricted the review by the English language and the time period of the search so there are restrictions. Please fix this.

7. Please list the government and NGO organisations that you will be searching.

8. The data extraction sections are very confusing in the 'selection process' and 'Data collection and analysis sections'. What is 'data elements abstracted' (line 200)? How come there are two different data extraction variables. Please make this clearer. This is clearer outlined reference 34? Why aren't two people extracting data?

9. Risk of bias need its own heading with the appropriate information.
10. Line 214-216 - 'Any additional observational studies retrieved as part of the supplementary search will be assessed using the proposed Meta-analysis of Observational Studies in Epidemiology checklist.' What does this mean? What additional observational studies there is no mention of this in the methods? Are you assessing all studies using this checklist? Why please justify.

11. Review synthesis and reporting: How will you know if there has been selective reporting please mention how you will do this?
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