



**SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM**

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
<p>Authors should review their results.</p> <p>In the results section:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is written: When dental aesthetic index was co related with mean width of smile and mean number of teeth shown during smiling it was seen that there existed a negative correlation between the degree of malocclusion i.e. Dental Aesthetic Index and mean width of the smile and number of teeth shown during smiling (Tab 2)</li> <li>2. MEAN TEETH SEEN DURING SMILE MEAN WIDTH OF SMILE</li> <li>3. SEVERITY OF MAL-OCCLUSION R = - 0.453, P &lt;0.001 R = - 0.121; P &lt;0.001</li> <li>4. TAB 2: CORRELATION OF ORAL HEALTH INDICATORS, SELF-EVALUATION BY CHILDREN, PARENTS 'EVALUATIONS AND VIDEO BASED ASSESSMENT OF CHILDRENS' SMILES.</li> <li>5. The correlation results should be interpreted according to: Hinkle DE, Wiersma W, Jurs SG. Applied Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. 5th ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin; 2003</li> <li>6. It is not enough that the correlation has been statistically significant, the size of the association must be interpreted.</li> <li>7. Size of Correlation Interpretation</li> <li>8. .90 to 1.00 (-.90 to -1.00) Very high positive (negative) correlation</li> <li>9. .70 to .90 (-.70 to -.90) High positive (negative) correlation</li> <li>10. .50 to .70 (-.50 to -.70) Moderate positive (negative) correlation</li> <li>11. .30 to .50 (-.30 to -.50) Low positive (negative) correlation</li> <li>12. .00 to .30 (.00 to -.30) negligible correlation</li> </ol>	<p>Respected sir,</p> <p>There has been a mistake by my statistician.. He mixed up the rows and columns as a result the readings were not conclusive. I have made the required changes in the result section. Pls accept my apologies.</p>