

Subject: [BDS] Editor Decision

Dear Sofia Bauer Rieger, Luiz Evaristo Ricci Volpato, Ariane Paredes de Sousa Gil, João Guilherme Medeiros Leite, Lucas Guimarães Abreu:

Your submission Oral health of populations living in settlements: systematic review and meta-analysis to Brazilian Dental Science, has been revised and according to reviewers' comments, there are questions to be addressed and/or points to be clarified/corrected.

Please answer the reviewers considerations point-by-point in a separate document and also please make all the corrections in the text highlighted in yellow.

Deadline: 30 days

Thank you for considering Brazilian Dental Science for publishing your research. We are looking forward the revised version of you manuscript.

Sincerely,

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

Questionnaire

Does the manuscript contain new and significant information to justify publication?*

No

Does the Abstract (Summary) clearly and accurately describe the content of the article?

Yes

Is the problem significant and concisely stated?

No

Are the methods or research design described comprehensively? Is the statistical analysis adequate?

No

Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the results?

Yes

Is adequate reference made to other work in the field?

Yes

Is the language acceptable?

No

Manuscript Structure

Length of article is:*

Adequate

Number of tables is:

Adequate

Number of figures is:

Adequate

Please state any conflict(s) of interest that you have in relation to the review of this paper (state “none” if this is not applicable).

NONE

Rating

Interest*

Good

Quality

Below Average

Originality

Excellent

Overall

Average

Recommendation

Major Revision

Would you be willing to review a revision of this manuscript?

Yes

Comments

Comments to the Author

Title

From the title, the specific type of settlement should be clearly indicated.

Abstract

The abstract should be aligned with the PRISMA checklist. Some key elements are missing, such as a clear description of the statistical analysis performed. I recommend to use both declarations, PRISMA and JBI. PRISMA could serve as basis for reporting the review.

Definition and context of settlements

Greater context and a clear definition of what is considered a “settlement” are required, as this concept is currently ambiguous.

Introduction

The introduction lacks a clear justification for the study. It is recommended to include robust quantitative data (hard data) to support the statements and claims presented.

Aim statement

In the abstract, the aim should be stated directly as “to assess...”, avoiding

unnecessary redundancy.

Language and translation

Overall, the manuscript requires a thorough revision of the English language, as several translation issues are evident.

Methodological guidelines

The authors should include the JBI checklist corresponding to the methodology used and verify that all required steps were followed.

Search strategy

The date of the last literature search should be explicitly reported.

Study selection process

The manuscript should clearly explain how the study selection was conducted:

Were the two authors working independently, simultaneously, or in consensus from the beginning?

Eligibility criteria

There is insufficient information regarding the eligibility criteria. These should be clearly specified and structured according to the PICO framework used.

Data extraction and population

More detailed information should be provided on the key and relevant data extracted, as it is currently unclear what exactly is being studied, particularly with regard to the population definition.

Reviewer disagreements

The statement “Divergences of opinion between the reviewers were resolved through discussion until reaching a consensus” requires clarification:

What was the role of the other authors in this process?

Statistical analysis

More comprehensive information regarding the statistical analysis employed is required.

Article selection section

The Article Selection subsection should describe the process in a more detailed and stepwise manner.

Characteristics of included studies

This section is not appropriately structured. It should present general characteristics of the included studies, such as:

Databases of origin

Year of publication

Authors

Countries

Quality of evidence vs. risk of bias

There appears to be confusion between quality of evidence and risk of bias; these are not equivalent concepts and should be addressed separately.

Assessment of evidence quality

A specific quality assessment judgment for each included article should be provided.

Discussion section

The discussion should be expanded to include:

Strengths of the study

Limitations

Implications for practice and future research
