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Reviewer's report:

Overall comments:
1. The purpose and clinical implication of this questionnaire should be written down in the text. Is PDA is useful for diagnosis, measuring treatment effect? Etc.
2. These questionnaire results are influenced by past denture experience. However, you have not shown on this factor. What are the participants’ characteristics of experience to past dentures: ie number of the denture they had worn? your discussion in the second paragraph in p11 should be discussed with those data.

Background:
1. In the third paragraph, you have mentioned, “some patient satisfaction evaluation methods depend on only one question [4, 5]”. But most of the VAS ratings are questionnaire is composed of several questions and asking top and bottom dentures respectively. What are the advantages of your PDA compared to those questionnaires?
2. Please refer the VAS complete denture specific questionnaire such as Feine etal or Kawai etal or others.
3. Please enter “the” before PDA. At page 5 line 18

Methods and results:
1. Why “test-retest” was carried out by randomly selected 33 patients out of 122 patients? If you can write the reasons, please do so.
2. You have excluded the person of dementia. How did you assessed them? Have you done any testing such as MMSE?
3. Please enter the ethical approval number.
4. In the “Development of the PDA” section p7 line 3, “Questions items that were similar to other factors were eliminated and few new questions……”. I cannot catch “similar to other factors” please explain.
5. In the clinical measurement section, the period between 1-PDA and 2-PDA could be identified as “two months” instead of “about two month”. Even if that is 62 or 59 days, it does not influence the results.
6. Please explain if there is a criteria or cut off of “responsiveness”. Your result shows the value of 0.97, which is hard to decide this usefulness to the readers.
Discussion:
1. As told earlier, you should make clear the purpose of this questionnaire, diagnosis, prediction or effect measuring and discuss.
2. Why do you still keep “importance” even with low alpha level and prone to ceiling effect? Please make it clear.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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