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Response to the Reviewers

Reviewer: Z Marshman

In response to the specific points.

6. Limitations to the study, we have included the burden of having a research assistant to read the questionnaires to the children.

8. We have added the specific ages to the abstract to make it clearer.

Minor revisions

1. We have added two sentences in the abstract to clarify for readers the reviewers comment.

2. 
   a. We have included a sentence stating that the younger version was not ever validated
   b. We have included a sentence with respect to the COHIP stating that it requires further testing.
   c. We have rephrased the sentence as the reviewer has suggested.

3. We believe that Figure 1 highlights the strength of the correlation more than describing and believe it adds to the paper.

4. 
   a. We have included a sentence on the limitation of using a research assistant.
   b. We have included a sentence on the face and content validity and how this is an area of further research required.
   c. We have reworded the floor effects sentence for clarity.

Reviewer: Maria Beatriz Gaviao

Major revisions:

1. Thank you for this comment however the original items in the measure arose from an item pool tested qualitatively and quantitatively and was found to be valid in 8-to-10-year-olds. We have clarified in the paper that this requires further investigation particularly with face and content validity.

2. Thank you for this point but we have discussed this in the discussion that the CPQ 8-10 uses the 4-week time reference point and has been validated with this time reference in the age 8 to 10 year olds. Thus we did not randomly modify this questionnaire but actually opted to take the 8 to 10 time reference instead of the 11 to 14 as the literature states that in younger children a shorter time frame is better.

3. This study was undertaken as a feasibility study to test the questionnaires prior to a larger clinical trial. We believe the findings make an important contribution to the body of knowledge on OHRQoL in children.

4. We have clarified radiographs were taken as part of the study design as this was an intervention study for treatment of dental caries as part of their routine
dental care. There is absolutely no suggestion of radiographs having been used for research purposes only.