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Reviewer’s report:

This is a cross-sectional study aimed at assessing the relationship between socio-demographic factors with periodontal status and tooth loss in a group of pregnant women in Uganda.

The title and abstract generally reflects the content of the paper. The research question was well defined. However I have the following comments and questions:

Major compulsory revisions

1. Methodology: where and amongst whom was the questionnaire piloted?
2. How does length of pregnancy and marital status assess ‘psychosocial factors?’
3. In measuring oral hygiene with the OHIS, the authors categorized subjects into low and fair; this two categories are not related, the categories should be low, high or good, fair, poor depending on their choice.
3b. The categorisation ends at 1.67. What happens to scores over 1.67? There is a possibility of such because the highest score is 3 for each tooth and 6 sites were examined
3c. On tables 1 and 5, the authors went on to report the debris as ‘yes’ or ‘no’. Also under discussion, there was a mention of the ‘mean plaque score’. There should be consistency in scoring and reporting.
4. Results: Table 3: what does the ‘total’ row indicate? It is confusing and should be deleted
5. What does table 4 portray? The title is confusing and not enough explanation is given in the text. Explain table 4 in relation to table 3.
6. Table 5: should be changed to be more explicit. How can the titled of a table be in two sentences? Suggestion: Distribution of subjects by percentage of CPI score and Independent variables.
7. In general, presentation of results was rather long winded; repetition of results adequately shown on tables should be deleted i.e the ORs. Instead, the authors should focus on pointing out significant findings in the study in a logical sequence such that the reader is able to appreciate the findings in relation with their stated objectives.
8. Discussion: too long with a lot of unnecessary repetition of results. There is a
need to correct language throughout the body of the manuscript. Terms like ‘varied systematically’ should read ‘statistically significant’. Calculus cannot be described as ‘severe’ rather since it is a deposit, it would be better to describe as heavy, moderate or light deposits

Minor essential revisions

1. Abstract: Line 1- Prevalence's should read prevalence. In the conclusion, 65% is not a moderate prevalence of calculus and this should be rephrased appropriately.

2. Clinical examination: drying of the teeth is not a requirement for using the CPITN so there was no need to mention this. There should not be unnecessary lengthening of the manuscript

3. Results: Table 1: title should read ......................according to the category of independent....... not ‘on’

What does ‘ever breast problem’ mean and what is the relevance to this study as no mention of this was made in the text.

Discretionary revisions

In my opinion, table 2 is not relevant and can be deleted. It is sufficient to describe any difference between the two groups in the text.

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

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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