Reviewer's report

Title: Impact of health conditions on oral health-related quality of life of children with cerebral palsy

Version: 2 Date: 19 April 2011

Reviewer: Zoe Marshman

Reviewer's report:

Impact of health condition on oral health-related quality of life of children with cerebral palsy
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
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? Yes
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? Yes
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? Further limitations should be included
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? Yes
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? The title should be amended to ‘Parental reports of the oral health-related quality of life of children with cerebral palsy’
9. Is the writing acceptable? Generally yes

This study describes a cross sectional survey of the impact of oral conditions on the daily lives of children with cerebral palsy as reported by their parents. While the paper is generally well written there are a few amendments that are required:

Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1. Throughout the manuscript the authors should refer to the participants as children with cerebral palsy, instead of defining the children by their condition and using the term ‘CP children’.
2. The title should be amended to ‘Parental reports of the oral health-related quality of life of children with cerebral palsy’. The use of parents as proxies should be referred to in the aim in the abstract, in the background section of page 3 and in the discussion.
3. Background – in the second paragraph the authors state that children with CP have higher risk of oral disease due to the difficulty with effective oral hygiene,
the authors should consider the contribution of diet as well as oral care.

4. In the method section the authors should state why they chose to use proxies rather than ask the children themselves.

5. The authors describe the way they handled ‘don’t know’ responses in their analysis, other ways of handling don’t know responses are described in:


This paper should be referred to here.

6. The global ratings are not normally included in the P-CPQ or FIS total scores. It is not clear whether they are included in this study (p5), the authors need to clarify this as it has implications for comparability of the results.

7. In the discussion, the limitations of the study should include the level of agreement between child reports and the reports of parents as proxies, several studies have investigated the nature of this agreement.

8. On page 10, the authors describe the impact of lower income, they should discuss the findings of the paper by Locker 2007 (reference number 16).

9. The numbering of the reference list starts at 0, this should be re-numbered.
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