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Reviewer’s report:

The manuscript titled "Theory based interventions for caries related sugar intake in adults: Systematic review" aims to review effectiveness of the theory based interventions on sugar intake behaviors which were based on various psychological or behavioral models. Difference between "theory based" interventions and "atheoretical" interventions has not been well investigated in particular settings. The study aim is interesting and methods are clearly described.

I have following comments to the authors to improve the manuscript:

In P4 L79-, it is unclear what the sentences explained. Do they describe superiority of SCM based interventions in comparison to intervention without any "theory" or effectiveness of SCM based interventions relative to control condition? Please clarify the point.

Authors can describe advantages of theory based intervention to clarify the focus of this review.

Abbreviations in manuscript should be defined at their first mention (e.g., DMFT, DMFS).

The literature search strategy for Cochrane database (P21-22) seems to have duplicates.

Search results of #20 (#17-19) and #16 (#13-15) would be included in results of #4. It is better to be concise and consistent in literature search. Is there any reason for the duplicates?

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.

Unable to assess

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

Unable to assess
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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

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