

Dear Daniel Paiva:

Your submission Who Gets Funded? Determinants of Research Funding in Brazilian Oral Pathology and Oral Medicine 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: Accept Submission

Questionnaire

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

Yes

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

Yes

Is the problem significant and concisely stated?

Yes

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

Yes

Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the results?

Not Applicable

Is adequate reference made to other work in the field?

Yes

Is the language acceptable?

Yes

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

Good

Originality

Excellent

Overall

Good

Recommendation

Accept

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

Yes

Comments

Comments to the Author

Congratulations to the authors. The understanding of research funding is becoming increasingly relevant due to methodological expansion to different forms of academic collaboration and the formulation of scientific reports. In this context, the authors' work can contribute to a better understanding of the academic indicators that promote research funding, as well as to the establishment of effective guidelines for supporting research and innovation projects.

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

Questionnaire

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

Yes

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

Yes

Is the problem significant and concisely stated?

Yes

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

Yes

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?

Yes

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

Good

Originality

Good

Overall

Good

Recommendation

Minor Revision

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

Yes

Comments

Comments to the Author

Dear Sirs,

This is an interesting article on the scenario of research funding in stomatology and oral pathology. However, I suggest that the authors specify in the title and include in the discussion that this is a sample of researchers associated with the Brazilian Society of Stomatology and Oral Pathology. This is an important limitation of the study and is not necessarily representative of the Brazilian situation. One example of this that can be taken into consideration is that most of the researchers involved are women, which seems to be a different situation from that experienced in the current scientific research scenario. This also deserves discussion. In addition, another point to be considered is the racial issue of these researchers, given that there are projects funded by CNPq and Faperj currently focused on black researchers. Therefore, within this context, this discussion is also relevant. Another important point is that, in order to be consistent with the title, projects should be evaluated according to the funding agencies. How many projects related to oral pathology and stomatology have been funded by CNPq in the last 10 years? Not only those associated with SOBEP. If it is not possible to answer this question, this also needs to be discussed.
