

Subject: [BDS] Editor Decision

Dear Victória Geisa Brito de Oliveira, Fernanda Alves Feitosa, Leonardo Lemos de Souza, Mônica Ghislaine Oliveira Alves:

Your submission Reflections about care and professional training in a trans-inclusive Dentistry 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,

Sergio Eduardo de Paiva Gonçalves EDITOR-IN-CHIEF São Paulo State University (Unesp), Institute of Science and Technology, São José dos Campos, SP

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Decline Submission

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?

Not Applicable

Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the results?

Not Applicable

Is adequate reference made to other work in the field?

No

Is the language acceptable?

Yes

Manuscript Structure

Length of article is:*

Too Short

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*

Poor

Quality

Below Average

Originality

Poor

Overall

Below Average

Recommendation

Reject

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

Yes

Comments

Comments to the Author

Dear authors, while this topic is relevant to science and education, the manuscript does not present any new information or discussion to the scientific literature.

Furthermore, the expression "hormone therapy" is no longer appropriate. The transgender community calls for a new understanding of the use of hormones in the affirmation process. Therapy is associated with the treatment of diseases.

Another point is the use of the term "tertiary level" of the health system. In Brazil, health managers and professionals may have a clear understanding. However, considering other countries, the term "hospital level" is more common.

Reviewer C:

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?

Not Applicable

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:

Too Short

Number of figures is:

Too Short

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).

I declare that there is no conflict of interest as the reviewer of this manuscript.

Rating

Interest*

Good

Quality

Average

Originality

Good

Overall

Good

Recommendation

Minor Revision

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

Yes

Comments

Comments to the Author

This is a relevant thematic article and update committed to providing professional technical updates. The authors present a coherent, concise, and well-founded discourse. Perhaps they could show in a table some data tabulation that compares the current state of knowledge on the subject and the state of need, according to modernization/social change. However, this is not an obvious requirement for publication in this journal. Suggestions for Improvement 1. Reference 14 in the list has a portion omitted. 2. The authors argue, to some extent, that barriers exist against access to oral care for transgender people, but they focus on presenting scientific publications that have focused on the non-Brazilian population. Therefore, it is possible to suggest that they discuss this further in the text, either

by pointing out the reasons for the scarcity of these surveys in Brazil or in a self-critical way, considering that the Brazilian SUS (Unified Health System) may hypothetically not have as many barriers specifically for transgender people. Questions to be reflected upon include: Is accessibility to dental services in Brazil negligible for transgender people or for the majority of the population, regardless of their gender identity? 3. By focusing on providing information about the vulnerability of the transgender population, the manuscript presented little information about the gap or need to raise the level of knowledge, skill, and competence of dentists. This seems to have been given as the central objective of the manuscript. Therefore, it could be better developed in the text. For example, highlighting the discrepancy in knowledge about the specific needs of transgender people available in the literature and the scarcity of use of distance learning resources for professional training purposes (digital resources that are widely available today). 4. This sentence contains an assertion: "As the TG community increases its visibility in representing civil society and holding political offices, the violence will disproportionately affect those people". However, is there evidence of the aforementioned disproportion of violence? The field of politics is recognized as a field of disputes and psychological violence and can be independent of gender. If there is scientific evidence of this, it would be better to include it in the text and provide the reference.

As we have two different points of view about your manuscript, I have decided to give you a chance to better explore your manuscript according to the observations of both reviewers. Try to bring a more current discussion with some innovation.

Good luck.

Brazilian Dental Science