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Reviewer's report:

'Do we need more than one Child Perceptions Questionnaire for children and adolescents?'

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? Yes although further limitations could 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 Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?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 abstract could be clearer
9. Is the writing acceptable? Yes

- Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

This paper is of great interest to those working in the field of the oral health-related quality of life of children. The authors should be commended on conducted and reporting this important project. There are a few suggestions to improve the quality of the paper (minor essential revisions):

1. Abstract: The background section of the abstract should be re-worded to provide better background to readers who are less familiar with the authors previous work e.g the age groups of existing measures could be described in more detail (rather than just CPQ 8-10, CPQ 11-14 ) and the phrase 'younger New Zealand children' could be clarified here.

2. Background:

a. Although the original idea for COHQLQ was to include a version for children 6-8 years this was never developed so its mention in the second paragraph may
confuse some readers.

b. The problems with COHIP could be included to avoid some readers questioning why the authors did not just use this measure rather than the CPQ.

c. The sentence that starts ‘children younger than 8 years old remain problematic’ could be re-phrased as its not the children who are problematic but the measurement of their OHRQoL.

3. Results:
a. I’m not sure Figure 1 adds anything to the results section

4. Discussion:
a. The limitations paragraph acknowledges the use of a convenience sample as a weakness but states that administration by a research assistant is a strength. For some large surveys this would add considerably to the cost.

b. The authors could comment, if possible, on the acceptability/face/content validity of the measure and the time interval to young children and whether the research assistant had to clarify questions for them. If this is an area for further research then that should be stated.

c. The sentence in the third paragraph regarding floor effects is confusing and should be re-worded.

**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.
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