This is an interesting descriptive study into the perception of toothache in Brazil, but the paper needs more work.

Both in the abstract and in the second paragraph of the methods section, the authors refer to properly trained teams. This needs to be elaborated on. Properly trained in what?

At the end of the introduction section, I was expecting a sentence on why reporting this data was important, but it wasn’t there. The last paragraph in introduction section mentions the “scarcity of studies”, but we need to follow that on with a comment on why that is important.

“Secondary data” is mentioned in the first paragraph of the methods section. What is secondary data? This should be spelt out.

In the results section, the authors compare the results between the regions, but the reader has no way of knowing if the differences are statistically significant. The paper would be improved if either p values of even better, 95% confidence intervals rather than standard deviations, were given in Table 1. The same comment is also true with tables 2 and 3.

The authors do not look at other variables in the analysis. For example, age, sex and socioeconomic status (SES) would be expected to influence whether someone suffers from toothache. One region may have a lower SES than the others and would be expected to have more toothaches. Why not?

The last paragraph in the results section mentions that there was not a statistically significant difference in toothache intensity between the regions but then goes not to describe the differences. Well, that’s plain wrong. If there was not a statistically significant difference, then any difference could be purely by chance. This paragraph needs to be deleted.

The last two sentences in the conclusion do not follow on from what was found in the research described in this paper. Rather these comments should be in the discussion section.

The paper would be greatly improved by having someone go over the English grammar. The examples of errors are numerous, and just a few are noted below:

- The “b” in “Brazil” in the heading should be a capital “B”.
- In the Abstract, it should be #:0.05 not 5%, and the sentence beginning “regarding dental office’s visitations….” should be “regarding dental office
visitations….”
- The first use of WHO should be spelt out as World Health Organization (WHO).
- The last sentence in the second last paragraph in the introduction section beginning with “More than…” doesn’t make sense, both with the comment about “since the dentist’s appointment does not occur regularly” and the throw-away line about “socioeconomic status.”
- In the first sentence in the last paragraph in the introduction section, the word “the” should not be used.
- In the last paragraph in the methods section, the phrases “…the data was apart state capitals…” needs to be changed and should read as “…a descriptively analysis…”.
- In the paragraph in the results section starting with “Regarding “dental appointment” I don’t think the authors meant to say the Southeast capitals have the “best percentages”. Maybe they mean the “highest percentage”.
- In the following paragraph the initial wording of “Concern the variable…” needs to be changed.
- Through the whole paper present, rather than past, tense is used. Examples are found with the use of the words “is” instead of “was” and “are’ instead of “were”.

Minor issues:
- I suggest that the last few words in the final sentence of the introduction section starting with “…according to” is both not necessary and confusing. This is the first time we hear of the SB Brazil in the body of the paper and it is not defined what it is until we get to the methods section.
- The Oral Health Epidemiological Survey – SB Brazil mentioned in the second paragraph of the methods section needs to be referenced.
- The number “6” in the paragraph beginning with “Table 2 shows the aspects….” In the results section should be “six”.
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