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Thank you for the review of the manuscript “Change in Oral Impacts on Daily Performances (OIDP) with increasing age: Testing the evaluative properties of the OIDP frequency inventory using prospective data from Norway and Sweden”. We are grateful for the valuable comments from the reviewers. We have revised the manuscript according to their suggestions. Please find attached the revised manuscript. The response to reviewers’ comments is detailed below.

On behalf of the co-authors

Sincerely,

Ferda Gülcan
Referee 1-Sudaduang Krisdapong

Comment 2: Authors responded they have added the statement of self-administration. Also, considered evidence regarding high agreement between self-administered and interview methods.
- I cannot find such statement. It should appear in "Measures" (in Method) where OHRQoL measure was described. Instead, there appears a sentence "Participants were asked ...." (page 8), which generally refers to interview method.
- Please state and provide references regarding "the high agreement between self-admin and interview". This will support the method of self-admin used in this study.

It has been corrected accordingly. The references regarding the agreement between self-admin and interview were provided.

Comment 4: The sentence "Norwegian ... less likely to report improvement ..." remains in Conclusion. Looking at Table 5, OR of Norwegian is 1 while of Sweden is 1.1 but not significant, 95% CI = 0.9-1.3. So, no difference in OIDP improvement between two groups.

It has been checked and corrected.
Referee 2- Anna-Lena Ostberg

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS_R1

The paper has been revised according to my comments and most questions are attended to. My main comment after the revision is that the argument to focus on the main aim (first paragraph in the authors’ answer to Introduction and answer to my question about “cultural dimension” in Discussion) is to a certain degree contradictory to the second aim (about changes over time in tooth loss and OIDP according to country of residence).

We maintain that the extent to which we have discussed the differences/similarities in oral health care systems is satisfactory for this mainly methodological paper where the main purpose was to assess the psychometrical properties of the OIDP scale

MINOR ESSENTIAL REVISIONS

The authors consider that transition from free dental care is important to mention. OK, but the age for this is 20 years in Sweden. Also, both public and private dental care in Sweden treat young adults.

The sentence has been corrected.

If “known variability in oral conditions” (page 6, first para in Methods) is to be mentioned, this shall be verified with references.

A reference has been inserted – unfortunately this is a Norwegian one as the oral health by counties in Norway has not been presented in international studies.

Dnr:s for ethical permissions shall be given.

Dnr:s are now written

Page 8, line 3-7: why a parenthesis?

It has been removed.