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Reviewer's report:

General
This is a cross sectional study aimed to estimate the prevalence of toothache and associated factors in adults of Lages, Southern Brazil. Information is generated from a large population survey and used validated data collection questionnaires. The authors conducted the sampling carefully. I have some concerns in the analysis model in this study. My concerns are outlined below.

- Major Compulsory Revisions
This study was conducted based on the model of Hierarchical model to dental pain determination (Figure 1). This model is not helpful at all. It does not show the directions of determinants. For example, dental pain can influence uptake of dental care as they suggest in their discussion. And dental care teeth can influence pain.

There are no teeth in this model! What is the information base for the origin of this model?

All independent variables were finally used in the Poisson regression analyses. The model in Figure 1 does no explain the relationship between socioeconomic conditions and use of dental services or tobacco alcohol problems. How was multicollinearity in these variables at the Poisson regression analysed?

P8, Figure1
The “block 1”, “block 2” and “block 3” should be explained in Figure 1 and Methods.

Table2
The format (column) in the Table 2 and Table 2: continuation is not matched.

- Minor Essential Revisions
There are a few specific points:

Background:
Minor Point: This sentence does not make sense. English usage perhaps. Adults have not been systematically excluded. They do have access to dental services as they say they have access to urgent dental services centered on repair or extraction. “Additionally, the adult population has been systematically excluded
from dental health services, with access only to urgent dental services centered on repair or extraction [3].

In the result, Table1 and 2, CI 95% is 95% CI. (“95% CI” was used in the abstract.)

There are a few specific points:
Pg11Line 24 15% in IN is 15% in

There are a few specific points:
Pg11 Line 26 Riley et al.23 is Riley et al.[23]

- Discretionary Revisions
Per capita incomes were categorized to quartiles in this study. What is the average or mean of per capita incomes in Brazil? This information shows status in Lages in Brazil.
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