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Reviewer’s report:

Discretionary revisions

My answers to your specific questions:
1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? YES.
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? YES.
3. Are the data sound? YES, so they seem.
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition. YES, definitely.
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data. YES, undoubtedly.
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? YES. Limitations are discussed regarding the fact that the results are based "only" on the subjects self-report. In a strict dose-response analyse also clinical and lab data, radiology, EMG etc are desirable.
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? YES, although all but one reference are from the 1990’s and 2000’s. There are also epidemiological data from e.g. the 1970’s indicating associations between TMD and neck-shoulder problems and general muscle and joint problems. However, it may be the policy of the journal to acknowledge only references from later years?
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? YES.
9. Is the writing acceptable? YES, with the exception of a detail in the abstract, line 6, where "were" should be changed to "was".

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.