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Reviewer's report:

The authors assessed the literature focussing on the quality of evidence for the efficacy of diagnostic methods used to identify oral dryness. The concluded that the efficacy of the various methods is low and that the various methods/evaluation methods have to be better defined. Although the paper reads well and the conclusions are supported by sound data, there are two sections that need attention and revision to make the readership better understand as how the literature search and subsequent data analysis was performed.

- Discretionary Revisions:
  None

- Minor Essential Revisions:
  None

- Major Compulsory Revisions:
  # Page 4: the subdivision of causes of oral dryness is unclear to me. First the authors have to define what they mean by oral dryness? Is it chronic oral dryness lasting for months or temporary/occasionally oral dryness? Moreover, aplasia, local infection and ageing are (very) rare causes of oral dryness, while there are many causes of oral dryness that are not mentioned.
  # Page 6: Why to use pilocarpine as a MeSH term as there are many other sialogogues. Why to use xerostomia as a MeSH term and not hyposalivation?

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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