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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting and well written paper. The question posed by the authors is well defined, the methods appropriate and well described, the data are sound, the manuscript adheres to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition, the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data, the limitations of the work are clearly stated and the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found.

I only have some minor revisions:
- In the abstract the term "HRQoL is first used in the background section and not spelt out what it means, and if done makes the phase "a child health-related quality of life measure (HRQoL)," in the methods section of the abstract redundant.
- It may be wise to define what dmft at the d3 level for some readers.
- The results from table 1 are well described in the text and I wonder if this table is necessary.
- Twice in the paper, the authors indicate that CHU9D was lower in children with than without caries, but then goes onto to say that the difference was not statistically significant. Well, this means there wasn't a difference that could not be explained by chance. Some readers may find the existing terminology frustrating.
- Under authors' contributions is a line "This research was funded by a (awarded in 2011)" which should be deleted.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable
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