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Reviewer’s report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? – No
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? – Partially, as some details are NOT RELEVANT to this study but to PROMISE-EBF
3. Are the data sound? – Yes
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? - Yes
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? - Yes
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? - Yes
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? - Yes
9. Is the writing acceptable? - Yes

Please make your review as constructive and detailed as possible in your comments so that authors have the opportunity to overcome any serious deficiencies that you find and please also divide your comments into the following categories:

- Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)

1. Introduction: The aim of study (the last sentence but one) should be put as the last sentence before Methods.

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

1. The manuscript need to be paginated
2. Title to read: Socio-demographic factors related to periodontal status and tooth loss among pregnant women in Mbale district, Uganda
3. Use of term “microbial plaque” instead of “debris”
4. Under Introduction: Paragraph 2, 5th sentence from below, “Information on the prevalence … sub Saharan African countries is sparse [18]. The reference refers to Sri-Lanka and not Africa. Need to check!

5. The interview: Was the questionnaire back translated from local language to English?

6. Use of actual pocket depth (3.5-5.5mm) instead of the term “shallow pocket”, and “>5.5 mm or #6 mm” instead of “deep pockets”.

7. Age of the participants: #20 years: Need to indicate clearly the lower limit as this has implication in the index teeth to be probed in the CPITN index system.

8. Discussion:
   Need to comment the issue of “inequalities in their results”.
   Need to discuss the relevance of “owning a land” and “household assets” in relation to periodontal conditions.

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

1. Study area: Although the PROMISE-EBF study is a multi-centre, the reporting about periodontal status seems to be limited only to Uganda. Need to describe Mbale district population, how is it representative to the total Uganda population

2. Data analysis and presentation:
   The CPITN data need to be re-analysed to match with the WHO recommendation as also referred by the Authors (WHO 1997) Reference no.22, pg. 60, specifically Table no. 16 & 17.

   Authors Table presentations
   2.2.1: Table 1 –
   2.2.1.1 Need to indicate on the top of the columns (n=total for urban and rural populations)
   2.2.1.2 Consider omitting variables such as use of bed nets and ever breast problems (in Table 1 & 5) UNLESS you show their relevancy in literature review.
   2.2.2: Table 2 - Need to indicate on the top of the columns (n=total for Not participating and Participating)
   2.2.3: Table 3 - Need RE-ANALYSIS to match WHO 1997 recommendations (Tables 16 & 17 in ref. no. 22)
   2.2.3.1 Percentage of subjects with …and NOT % of sextants.
   2.2.3.2 Mean number of sextants with healthy periodontal tissues, bleeding or higher score “NOT JUST bleeding”.
   2.2.4: Table 4 - Can be DELETED
   2.2.5 Tables 5 & 6 Can be tabulated after re-analysis in 2.2.3 above.
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