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Reviewer’s report:

This article focused on the patients’ subjective assessment of the frequency, importance and oral cleanliness regarding dental visits and oral prophylaxis. The authors assessed these items at 6-, 12- and 24 months intervals in a randomised 3-armed parallel clinical trial evaluating patient-completed questionnaires. The manuscript is well written, and may draw attention at the real necessity of dental visits scheduled on a 6-monthly bases.

The authors define well the aim of their trial and explain thoroughly the subjects recruited for the study, as well as the methods used for investigating the posed questions.

The results indicate higher levels of self-reported oral cleanliness for the patients in the 6 monthly ‘scale and polish’-visit group as compared to subjects recalled at 24 months; these partly dismiss the null hypotheses of the study according to which there would be no difference between groups. A statistical significant difference could be only shown between the groups receiving scale and polish visits at 6- and 24 month intervals. The results are described precisely and well organised.

The authors also present a well-balanced and evidence-based discussion of their results. They also report on the limitation of the present trial, presenting results based on the evaluation of non-validated questionnaires. The present article relies on the practice-based clinical trial investigating the health outcomes of single-dental visit and oral prophylaxis, outcomes reported in a former article acknowledged in the present one.

Discretionary revisions

However, the following suggestion might improve the manuscript:

- The authors should shorten and present more organised and clearly the conclusions. Clinical relevance of the presented data should be more clearly stated; the presented conclusion in the latter part is rather unclear.

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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