

Submission Confirmation for Journal of Dentistry

Journal of Dentistry <eesserver@eesmail.elsevier.com>

Sat 3/03/2018 10:10 AM

To: Ninuk Hariyani <ninuk.hariyani@adelaide.edu.au>;ninuk_hariyani@yahoo.co.id
<ninuk_hariyani@yahoo.co.id>

Dear Dr. Hariyani,

Your submission entitled "Root caries incidence and increment in the population - A systematic review, meta-analysis and meta-regression of longitudinal studies" has been received by the Journal of Dentistry.

You will be able to check on the progress of your paper by logging on to Elsevier Editorial System as an author. The URL is <https://ees.elsevier.com/jjod/>.

Your manuscript will be given a reference number once an Editor has been assigned.

Thank you for submitting your work to this journal.

Kind regards,

Journal of Dentistry

A manuscript number has been assigned

Journal of Dentistry <eesserver@eesmail.elsevier.com>

Wed 14/03/2018 6:57 AM

To: Ninuk Hariyani <ninuk.hariyani@adelaide.edu.au>;ninuk_hariyani@yahoo.co.id
<ninuk_hariyani@yahoo.co.id>

Dear Dr. Hariyani,

Your submission entitled "Root caries incidence and increment in the population - A systematic review, meta-analysis and meta-regression of longitudinal studies" has been assigned the following manuscript number: JJOD-D-18-00210.

You will be able to check on the progress of your paper by logging on to the Elsevier Editorial System as an author.

The URL is <https://ees.elsevier.com/jjod/>.

Thank you for submitting your work to this journal.

Kind regards,

Journal of Dentistry

Revision needed for JJOD-D-18-00210R1

Journal of Dentistry <eesserver@eesmail.elsevier.com>

Mon 18/04/2018 12:07 PM

To: Ninuk Hariyani <ninuk.hariyani@adelaide.edu.au>;ninuk_hariyani@yahoo.co.id
<ninuk_hariyani@yahoo.co.id>

Ref.: Ms. No. JJOD-D-18-00210

Root caries incidence and increment in the population - A systematic review, meta-analysis and meta-regression of longitudinal studies Journal of Dentistry

Dear Dr. Hariyani,

Your recent submission has been assessed by expert international reviewers. I have studied the reviews received from our referees and I am pleased to tell you that your paper may be acceptable for publication in the Journal of Dentistry, but requires revision before I can consider it further for publication.

I therefore invite you to submit a revised manuscript, taking account of the reviewers' comments. I would be grateful that you underline changes in the revised manuscript (not necessary for minor grammatical changes). Could I also please ask that you submit a point-by-point response to each of the reviewers comments and resubmit. If you do not wish to proceed, please let us know in order to complete our records. The maximum time allowed for revision is 8 weeks. If you feel you need longer than this please contact me.

Please be advised that a revise and resubmit of your paper does not necessarily lead to acceptance. The paper will be reviewed by our editorial board and a decision made on its suitability for the journal, in light of the revisions made according to the referees' comments.

Please note:

Any figures and tables should be included, even if these are unaltered.

It is the author's responsibility to ensure that data presented in figures and tables agree with that provided in the text. Please cross check figures, tables and text carefully.

When submitting your revised manuscript, please ensure that you upload the source files (e.g. Word). Uploading only a PDF file at this stage will create delays should your manuscript be finally accepted for publication. If your revised submission does not include the source files, we will contact you to request them.

Please note that this journal offers a new, free service called AudioSlides: brief, webcast-style presentations that are shown next to published articles on ScienceDirect (see also <http://www.elsevier.com/audioslides>). If your paper is accepted for publication, you will automatically receive an invitation to create an AudioSlides presentation.

I look forward to receiving your revised paper.

For your guidance, reviewers' comments are appended below.

To submit a revision, go to <https://ees.elsevier.com/jjod/> and log in as an Author. You will see a menu item call Submission Needing Revision. You will find your submission record there.

This journal offers a free service called AudioSlides. These are brief, webcast-style presentations that are shown next to published articles on ScienceDirect and can be viewed for free. This format gives you the

opportunity to explain your research in your own words and promote your work by embedding it on your own website and sharing in social media. For more information and examples, please visit

<http://www.elsevier.com/audioslides> or watch our webinar:

<https://www.publishingcampus.elsevier.com/pages/206/Tell-your-research-story-with-AudioSlides.html>

Include interactive data visualizations in your publication and let your readers interact and engage more closely with your research. Follow the instructions here: <https://www.elsevier.com/authors/author-services/data-visualization> to find out about available data visualization options and how to include them with your article.

Yours sincerely

Claire Brimilcombe

Journal Manager

On behalf of

Professor. Christopher D. Lynch

Editor in Chief

Journal of Dentistry

Reviewers' comments:

Reviewer comments: Please adhere more closely both to PRISMA and PRISMA for Abstracts

Reviewer #1: A well written and concise manuscript with clear conclusion.

Reviewer #3: Please find attached Microsoft Word document in reviewer attachments, with edits/comments marked in RED. Thank you.

This is a well-written article, heavy with statistical analyses. Although a little more depth may be given toward conclusions and findings of the meta-analysis, there is very good evidence of an in-depth meta-analysis of root caries, with reliable results. Patient/subject age as a particular factor in each analyzed article, could have been reported and discussed more. A bit more emphasis on discussing/interpretation of the results as to how they translate to root caries in particular populations would suffice to make this a very solid article.

Submission Confirmation for JJOD-D-18-00210R1

Journal of Dentistry <eesserver@eesmail.elsevier.com>

Mon 18/06/2018 12:07 PM

To: Ninuk Hariyani <ninuk.hariyani@adelaide.edu.au>;ninuk_hariyani@yahoo.co.id
<ninuk_hariyani@yahoo.co.id>

Ref.: Ms. No. JJOD-D-18-00210R1

Root caries incidence and increment in the population - A systematic review, meta-analysis and meta-regression of longitudinal studies

Dear Dr. Hariyani,

Journal of Dentistry has received your revised submission.

You may check the status of your manuscript by logging onto Elsevier Editorial at
(<https://ees.elsevier.com/jjod/>).

Kind regards,

Journal of Dentistry

Your Submission

Journal of Dentistry <eesserver@eesmail.elsevier.com>

Thu 21/06/2018 3:20 AM

To: Ninuk Hariyani <ninuk.hariyani@adelaide.edu.au>;ninuk_hariyani@yahoo.co.id
<ninuk_hariyani@yahoo.co.id>

Ref.: Ms. No. JJOD-D-18-00210R1

Root caries incidence and increment in the population - A systematic review, meta-analysis and meta-regression of longitudinal studies

Journal of Dentistry

Dear Dr. Hariyani,

I am pleased to tell you that your work has now been accepted for publication in the Journal of Dentistry.

Your accepted manuscript will now be transferred to our production department and work will begin on creation of the proof. If we need any additional information to create the proof, we will let you know. If not, you will be contacted again in the next few days with a request to approve the proof and to complete a number of online forms that are required for publication.

Comments from the Editor and Reviewers (if applicable) can be found below.

This journal offers a free service called AudioSlides. These are brief, webcast-style presentations that are shown next to published articles on ScienceDirect and can be viewed for free. This format gives you the opportunity to explain your research in your own words and promote your work by embedding it on your own website and sharing in social media. For more information and examples, please visit <http://www.elsevier.com/audioslides> or watch our webinar: <https://www.publishingcampus.elsevier.com/pages/206/Tell-your-research-story-with-AudioSlides.html>

Thank you for submitting your work to this journal.

With kind regards

Professor. Christopher D. Lynch
Editor in Chief
Journal of Dentistry

Comments from the Editors and Reviewers:



Department of Dental Public Health

Faculty of dental medicine
Universitas Airlangga

Ninuk Hariyani
Lecturer and Researcher

18th June 2018

Professor. Christopher D. Lynch
Editor in Chief
Journal of Dentistry

Faculty of Dental Medicine (FKG)
Universitas Airlangga
East Java 60132
Indonesia
Telephone +62 81314343305
ninuk_hariyani@yahoo.co.id
ninuk-h@fkq.unair.ac.id
ninuk.hariyani@adelaide.edu.au

Dear Professor Lynch,

We are very grateful to you for the opportunity to revise our manuscript and we acknowledge the time spent by the editors and reviewers in commenting on this paper. Please find below a point-by-point reply to reviewers' comments. We hope that we have now addressed their concerns and will be happy to provide further clarifications, if required.

Thanking you.

Yours sincerely,

Ninuk Hariyani (Corresponding Author)

PhD Candidate
Australian Research Centre for Population Oral Health (ARCPOH)
Adelaide Dental School
The University of Adelaide
South Australia
Australia
Tel: +61 8 8313 2556 Fax: +61 8 8313 3070
Email: ninuk.hariyani@adelaide.edu.au

Comments from Reviewers:

General comments: Please adhere more closely both to PRISMA and PRISMA for Abstracts.

Response:- The authors thank the reviewers for highlighting this concern. This article have followed the PRISMA guidelines (including providing the flowchart). Both the manuscript and the abstract have reported all the required aspects in PRISMA. It was stated in the method section in the manuscript (page 4 line 95-96). More detailed discussion parts have been added to be more adhere with PRISMA guidelines (page 10 line 279-289).

Reviewer: 1

Comment 1:- A well written and concise manuscript with clear conclusion.

Response:- Thank you very much for your positive feedback on our manuscript.

Reviewer: 3

Comment 1:- Please find attached Microsoft Word document in reviewer attachments, with edits/comments marked in RED. Thank you.

Response:- The authors have now addressed each of the concern. Detail of the responds could be seen in the table below:

no	Reviewer's comments	Actions taken
1	Minor grammatical changes were suggested in various sections	Accepted the suggestions.
2	Define the incidence and increment.	Definition of the incident and increment have been added to introduction session in page 2 line 34-40.
3	Discuss patient/subject age or age ranges in the various studies	The explanation has been added in the result session in page 7 line 197-199.
4	Does incidence refer to the finding of any active root caries per individual in a population or does it include past incidence? Is it an incidence of NEW caries per year in longitudinal studies?	Definition of the incident and increment have been added to introduction session in page 2 line 34-40. it is an incidence of NEW caries in longitudinal studies. In this meta-analysis, we only reported the annual incidence of root DFS (incidence of NEW caries per year, both treated or untreated)
5	Does increment refer to the number of old and/or new DFS in any individual at a given time and per year in longitudinal studies?	Definition of the incident and increment have been added to introduction session in page 2 line 34-40. Increment refer to the number of new root DFS in any individual in longitudinal studies. In this meta-analysis, we only reported the annual increment of root DFS.
6	Is there any way to analyse the articles to break down incidence and increment by age groups? Were younger or older adults used in the specific studies?	It is difficult to break down the incidence and increment by age groups in this meta-analysis, as the age is already the mean of respondents' baseline age reported in the baseline article or related article. Break down by age groups was not possible as not all the primary article provided data on similar age groups. However, the mean age is quite similar across studies (see appendix 3). This age could be categorized as retirement age (60-70). The explanation has been added in the result session in page 7 line 197-199.
7	As presented, the information cannot be reliably utilized specifically for decision making with	As we have presented in appendix 3, the mean of baseline age was relatively dense in the retirement age

certain aged population groups or for healthcare policy or provision of services, when often age is an important consideration.	group (60-70 years old), then, the policy could be directed to the age group. This has been added to the discussion session in page 10 line 279-289.
---	--

Comment 2:- This is a well-written article, heavy with statistical analyses. Although a little more depth may be given toward conclusions and findings of the meta-analysis, there is very good evidence of an in-depth meta-analysis of root caries, with reliable results.

Response:- Thank you very much for your positive feedback on our manuscript.

Comment 3:- Patient/subject age as a particular factor in each analysed article, could have been reported and discussed more.

Response:- Thank you very much for your suggestion. More information and discussion have been provided in the manuscript (in the result and discussion session in page 7 (line 197-199) and page 10 (line 279-289), respectively).

Comment 4:- A bit more emphasis on discussing/interpretation of the results as to how they translate to root caries in particular populations would suffice to make this a very solid article.

Response:- Thank you very much for your positive feedback on our manuscript. This point has now been added discussion session in page10 (line 279-289).