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Reviewer's report:

- Major Compulsory Revisions

General comment
The authors have met most of my points raised. My main concern about inverted odds ratios is attended to, very good. However, I have still some comments.

# The term “oral health issues”
This term was used in a heading in a referred report. An alternative, and more specific, description would be “dental problems and treatment”. Please consider.

# The conclusion in the abstract
This is re-formulated I am afraid, to be more vague than before. The one in the main text is better specified.

METHODS
# Answer options
A suggestion for describing answer options is to refer to Table 1 here in the Methods.

# Exclusion of variables due to multicollinearity
This is now better described. However, please consider to give the VIF in the tables.

# The data were collected between March 2007 and March 2009 and the average household wages per occupation classification from February 2012 were used to estimate individual losses. Still, I think this is not relevant.
The reason for doing like this is stated to be that the average wage data from the Canadian Labour Force Survey during the CHMS survey period was not publicly available. Did you try to get access to these data?

RESULTS
# Tables
The tables are still very extensive. They are easier to understand now, with consistent OR:s. However, this brings out that most confidence intervals were
overlapping. When writing for instance (p8 §1) “as income decreased so did the odds of reporting time loss” – was this statistically tested?

Table 1: there is still no option for those =high school. “Frequency of seeing dental professional”: the options should preferably be placed in ascending or descending order.

Table 2: I acknowledge that the epidemiological measures are now commented on. However, it is still unclear how there can be exactly the same numbers for the primary and the permanent dentitions.

Table 4: according to the answer to my question all the variables were included in one single regression model. This must be explained in the heading of the table.

Table 6: The answer to my question regarding Table 6 should preferably be included in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

The low participation rate has been added to the results (just over 50%), but is not discussed. Also and perhaps related to this, the extension of the questionnaire is an issue. The authors refer to a paper describing the validation process, thank-you. Nonetheless, the risk of having less engaged answers, or a reason of denying to participate, when asking a high number of questions (722) could not be disregarded.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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