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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
- The study presents results about oral health-related quality of life (OHRQoL) from a developing country. This is interesting and new. However, it is not clear how far the study results from “two large outpatient medical care facilities … all in Benin City, Edo State” can be generalized to. Study subjects seem to be well-educated and socioeconomic status is an important factor for OHRQoL. This may limit the generalizability and implications of the subject selection process should be addressed in the discussion.
- An earlier version of the OHQOL-UK instrument was used. It needs to be explained in the methods section what the differences are compared to the current version of the instrument. Are the present study results using the earlier instrument version generalizable to investigations using the current version of the instrument (discussion)?
- The precision of the study estimates is important. For key results (e.g., the proportion of participants perceiving their oral health as affecting their quality of life, or the instrument’s median/mean summary score in the sample) confidence intervals need to be reported.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
- “oral health related quality of life factors” (abstract) is ambiguous. Please describe in detail.
- The asterisk in table 2 should be explained (probably similar as in table 3).

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
- Although the used oral health-related quality of life instrument is widely used, a paragraph in the methods section should give more details for the reader not familiar with the instrument.
- Table 3 uses two asterisks to mark results close to statistical significance. This may be misleading because often a system with one, two, and three asterisks is used to characterize different levels of statistical significance (in this system two asterisks mean “highly” statistically significant results).

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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