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Reviewer’s report:

The manuscript has much improved. Authors’ effort is appreciated. However, I still think that this paper could be much better if authors would try a little bit more on the following points:

Major points

1. Objectives: It now says only “to assess clinical, .... and QoL”. I wonder if what authors have done a lot and seem to be more interesting than descriptive findings, i.e. relationships between clinical variables and sociodemographic and visual impairment could be added as another objective.

2. Statistical analyses: Please rethink again what should be done and the rationales behind, and then explain it in full in Methods. Table 2, statistical analyses throughout the paper need more work with sound theoretical grounds. In Methods, it says only “binary logistic regression ....”. Please clarify what you have done step by step and rationales for doing so. I found in Table 2 that adjusted analysis was carried out only for caries. Why not for other clinical and OIDP outcomes? Which variables were controlled for in the adjusted analyses and why? Also, please clarify the last sentence in Results, TDI “However, the examined variables could not be fit into a ..... model”.

3. Interpretation of findings: I found what you say in Results are opposite to what appear in Table 2. Please check whether we it was CVI or PVI that was 6 times more likely than counterparts to have poor OHI, and which was 4 times more likely to have TDI. In addition, association between OHI and visual impairment was significant, at the unadjusted step in Table 2, but you say it was not significant in Results. Conversely, association between caries and OIDP was not significant (in Table) but you say it was in Results. I assume from the last sentence in Results where some words are missing which is unacceptable!

4. Overall findings are yet known: Please try a bit more on statistical analyses and interpreting findings as abovementioned. At the moment, readers are not able to grasp the picture of your findings. So, discussion and conclusion cannot be commented.

Minor points

1. Please check citations. You have name and 2 sets of parenthese after, (year) [ref no.]. Should it be name [ref no.].

2. Please check table 2 whether baseline (OR = 1) is indicated in all places. Something are missing from footnote “p<”, “chi-square=”, “R2=”. These mistakes
are unacceptable! Please state in footnotes which variables were adjusted for. Please spell out all abbreviations in full in Footnotes. Lastly and importantly, please improve your table title.

3. You can keep the the first part of The Child OIDP paragraph (in Results). But it does not fit there. Findings of other studies where you referred to should be in Introduction, Methods or Discussion as appropriate. In Results, it should contain results of your study. So, ‘normally’ no citation appears in Results. I found the first sentence repeats a sentence in Methods.

**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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