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**Reviewer's report:**

This is a cross-sectional study which assessed the prevalence of tooth wear and investigated the possible factors in relation to tooth wear among Chinese adults aged 40-50 years. The topics were interesting, but the study methods and statistical analysis were problematic.

1. **Introduction**
   
The Introduction section is too long. In addition, important information was lacking. Major revision is needed. Authors should review and previous studies regarding the association between various factors and tooth wear, and summarize the results of those study. I do not think that it is necessary to describe the image assessment of tooth wear. In the present study, the image assessment was not used.

2. **Methods**
   
The methods of recruitment of study subjects were unclear. When did the researchers recruit study subjects? What are the criteria used for recruitment for eligible subjects? Did study subjects suffer from disease or medication related to tooth wear? What is the ratio male to female in the study subject? The authors stated that restored or caries teeth were excluded from analysis. Please provide the prevalence of these situations. What factors were controlled for in the multivariate analysis? And provide the reference categories of variables in the multivariate analysis.

3. **Results**
   
In Table 3 shows, for example, prevalence of tooth wear of molar group in maxilla was 85.5% and score range 1-3. According to Table 1, score 0 is equal to no tooth wear. Thus, the prevalence of tooth wear of molar group in maxilla is 100%? Please confirm as well as the canine and incisor groups in maxilla and molar and incisor groups in mandible. 

Please provide odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals in the multiple logistic regression analysis.

4. **Discussion**
   
The Discussion section is not organized, and it is difficult to follow to read. The authors should describe clearly about advantages and limitations of the study, comparison others studies, mechanisms, and conclusions.
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