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Reviewer's report:

This paper uses the German Network for the assessment of Quantitative Sensory Assessment of patients with Lingual Nerve injury and Burning Mouth Syndrome

There are small groups involved Control n=8 Lingual nerve injury n=4 and Burning mouth n=5 despite the low group number significant differences are reported. I have asked for an independent statistical review

The aims and objectives are clear

The methodology is not

The authors refer the German Network methodology but they do not outline the equipment and processes. what diagnostic criteria were used to select lingual nerve injury and Burning mouth patients?

Results

There is no mention of the relative demographics of the groups or pain presentation features

The 5 groupings for statistical analysis require better explanation

Control group findings

LNI vs control group

LNI Vs contralateral uninjured side

BMS vis foot

BMS vs control group
This excluded two further comparisons

The contralateral uninjured side of the LNI patients being compared with Controls

The BMS has not been compared directly with the LNI injured side

The English used in the legends of the Tables and figures requires modification to ensure clarity

The conclusions are sound based upon the data presented if I have interpreted the tables and figures correctly

Lastly the authors omit a recent reference that provides some interesting and similar findings in significantly larger groups and should be included in the discussion.


Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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