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**Reviewer’s report:**

This paper reports the results of work to translate and validate a Dutch version of the OHIP. The manuscript is clearly written and the authors have used appropriate methods to perform the work described. Nevertheless, the manuscript could benefit from a number of issues being clarified.

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

- The authors should better justify the nature and size of the sample they recruited
- In their description of the investigation of construct validity, the authors should explicitly state their a priori hypotheses in the methods section
- In the same section on construct validity, the authors should describe the analytic strategies they used to address these hypotheses. In their description of the results, the authors mention using Spearman’s correlation coefficients and point-biserial correlation. They need to justify why they used this approach rather than alternative approaches. Also they need to discuss the issue of effect size which relates back to the sample size they chose
- Again in the construct validity section, do the authors have any evidence supporting the validity of the questions they asked on burning mouth, number of teeth etc?
- The authors need to discuss the study’s limitations in the discussion section

**Discretionary Revisions** (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore) none

**Minor Essential Revisions** (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct) none

**What next?:** Accept after minor essential revisions

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

Declaration of competing interests:
'I declare that I have no competing interests'