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Reviewer's report:

The aim of this study was to verify the reliability and validity of the Child Oral Health Quality of Life Questionnaires (COHQOL) instruments the CPQ8-10 and short-form CPQ11-14 in younger children, and to determine whether a single measure for children aged 5-14 is feasible.

In a general way, the manuscript is well written and the data were analyzed correctly, considering the authors' expertise in this field. Nonetheless, several doubts arose (Major Compulsory Revisions):

Considering that the CPQ questionnaires were developed taking into account cognitive abilities and lifestyles in an age range from 8 to 10 years (CPQ8–10) and from 11 to 14 years (CPQ11–14) and the authors' considerations about child development in the Introduction (page 4, line 10), it is questionable whether those questionnaires should be applied for children under 8. Moreover, in the discussion about the domain “social wellbeing” it was commented that children could not have understanding the respective items in either instrument.

Other doubt point is the reference period, since in CPQ11–14 it is three months and it was adopted a reference period of 4 weeks. It is obvious that the period must be shortened for young children, but not randomly. It must be taken into account the child’s cognitive development. It seems very simplistic to take validated questionnaires and apply them for other population, with random modifications.

Despite a convenience sample has been considered as a limitation, maybe it must be a fail in the design. The children were attending for dental treatment and presented a higher dmft, so the results could be expected. In the Conclusion there is an important suggestion: research with population-based samples and in other settings is required. Maybe, this design should be taking into account before the results of present study have been published.

Although radiographies give more accurate diagnosis of caries status, it is questionable to exposure children to radiation for research aims. This point needs to be clarified along the text.
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