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Reviewer’s report:

Minor Essential Revisions

General comments,

This study tried to show reliability and validity of a questionnaire for self-assessment of complete dentures, demonstrating significance of newly fabricated complete dentures, and offered important knowledge. Also, this is a timely article as the populations of elderly in many countries have increased rapidly, and the authors make a strong point that newly fabricated dentures can have an impact on patients’ satisfaction. Thus, this is a unique manuscript and results are of interest. However, some contents are poor and should be revised.

1. A major problem with this manuscript is little of explanation of important key words, such as PDA and number of edentulous patients, in the beginning of Background section.

2. Another problem is that results were not well described in appropriate section. The results of statistical analyses were rather written in Discussion section than Results section. Several sentences expressing real values should be transfer to Results section.

Specific comments

1. Abstract: According to “Survey of Dental Diseases” conducted by Dental Health Division of Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare in Japan, the number of edentulous people have not significantly increased. Please explain clearly why authors claim demand for complete denture treatment is expected to rise over several decades in Japan.

2. Background: Since Patient Denture Assessment (PDA) seems to be not so common but considerably important in this article, authors had better explain it with additional sentences and references in the beginning of Background section.

3. P4, line 15: “Patient satisfaction” should be “Evaluation of patient satisfaction”

4. Table 2 does not contain ‘Before-2’ data. Comparison between ‘Before-1’ and ‘Before-2’ on Table 2 might give us interesting information although sample number was different between those.

5. P12, line 23: Conclusion is not clear, and authors should ask someone expertise to correct description in English.
Level of interest: An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

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

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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