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Reviewer’s report:

Comments to the Authors:

GENERAL COMMENT
This manuscript has been revised accordingly to comments. Only a few points still need to be attended to in the manuscript. In reduction of the text, some references have been lost or misleading please see below.

Some language errors still persist (see f i p5, §5, line 3 – “administered” shall be “administer”).

Introduction
P3, §2, last line: #20 and 21 deal with alcohol related diseases. This has been lost in the revision.
P3, bottom of page: the term “self-care health care” is probably meant to be “oral self-care”

Methods
P4, §2: Even if well-known to most potential readers, DMFT shall be explained.

The following is attended to in some aspects but not in all: “The dichotomizations of questionnaire items are still not specified (which were the original options before cutoffs were decided?).” Specifically, please see p6, §3: which were the options for the pupils to answer regarding *tooth-brushing (twice a day/once a day/once a week/seldom or never?), **use of fluoridated toothpaste (the same options perhaps?) and ***consumption of sugary snacks between meals (the same options or other?).

There is still some confusion about the median age. In page 7, §2, citation: “The median age for the study group was 10 years”. In page 8, §1, citation: “The mean age for the group was 11.1 ±2.4 years while the median age was 11 years”.

P8, §4, line 3: wrong sign for percentage.

Table 2: I suggest that the reference groups could be mentioned in a footnote: “Reference groups: ‘male sex’ and ‘age 11-16’. Statistical significances can be left to the reader to interpret that is, no “stars” are actually needed.

Discussion
P9. §2: references have not been kept in the revision. Especially sentence 3 needs one.

P9, bottom: restrict to context (Nigerian pupils).

Tables 2&3 are revised as pointed out. The legibility of the tables is enhanced however, there is one most important issue: the confidence intervals are removed both in the tables and in the text. This is a deterioration and was not requested. In this case, specifically one 95% CI including 1 is hidden. I commented that this was not to regard as statistically significant, but still this was advocated by the authors.
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