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Reviewer's report:

General

This is an excellent report on the psychometric properties of OHIP in Spanish.

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

It is stated on page 6 that the response options to each question (a 5-time scale) were transformed into a yes/no answer. It would be beneficial to discuss the implications/consequences of this modification.
- would the translation have the same validity and consistency on a 5-point scale?
- can the results of this study be compared with others?
- since the authors have the Spanish Language expertise, could they provide a translation of the 5-point scale to Spanish so that other investigators can use a point scale if they want to?
- The range of the total score is changed from 0 to 245 to 0 to 49

The choice of lifetime recall for OHIP is interesting for this young population. Have any other studies done this? Some additional discussion on this may help readers.

Figures could be deleted and results included in Table 3. It may be helpful to include the 95% CI for the ROC curve

Attachment loss of >= 1 mm could be excluded. While early attachment loss in this young population may indeed be marker for factors such as SES or obesity, it seems too small a number to be clinically relevant.

Table 4 Confidence interval for the Cronbach's alpha.

It may be helpful to explain how the average inter-item correlations were calculated in the Table 4. For instance, for functional limitation was the incorrelation coefficient for each question calculated, and the average correlation coefficient was subsequently calculated?

Delete Table 1 (report in text)

In the process of translations, did any words change considerably because people could not understand the meaning of the translated word? For instance, Brança Heloisa de Oliveira indicated that "being self-conscious" was changed to "being worried".

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
Move "oral health outcomes" to "discriminative validity"

In the discussion, it is first indicated that 'inability to function' was rare, and a couple of sentence later it is indicated that it had the highest impact. Could this be clarified?

The abstract could be improved by shortening the methods and by indicating which statistics in the results indicate a suitable convergent and discriminative validity and consistency. Also, the difference sample sizes (9155 and 9133) listed in the abstract may make readers confused.

**What next?:** Accept after discretionary revisions

**Level of interest:** An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No
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