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Reviewer’s report:

- 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)
  A more detailed description of the sample would be useful in evaluating the ability to generalise the results. In particular, details on number of teeth present, and denture wearing in addition to age and sex would be helpful.

- Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
  Further argument should be added to justify the choice of a quality of life measure as the means for validating the chewing function score in preference to other potential validation measures such as masticatory function measurement, reported food frequency, and comparison with other established chewing index scores such as the one developed by Leake.

  In addition, it would be more convincing to show not just the overall OHIP score and functional limitation items, but to include a breakdown of associations between the chewing function questionnaire and each individual OHIP item and each OHIP subscale.

  In the Discussion the authors need to be clear in explaining how chewing ability was considered to be ‘unidimensional’ when their findings demonstrated two factors or dimensions.
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