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Reviewer’s report:

This is an interesting manuscript describing validation of an alternative version of the chewing function questionnaire in partially edentulous patients

Comments

Title: There is no such thing as 'partially edentulous'. Edentulous means without any teeth. One can’t be “partially without any teeth”. The term partially dentate may be best to use.

Introduction

The introduction is clear and well written.

Methods

The statistical approach employed is appropriate. However it is unclear why Japanese OHIP-14 was used to validate the measure. Surely concurrent validity should have been assessed using another chewing measure if it is proposed that a new alternative measure should exist (i.e. the Sato measure). Be assured the reviewer feels positive of the need for new measure but ONLY if an existing measure is ineffective. This is a major concern that needs to be addressed.

Results

The results are clear

Discussion

Page 8 paragraph 2, starting with “when we investigated….”. this section should appear earlier in the text as it relates to the index’s structure. Comments should be made about test-retest reliability in the discussion not the conclusion.
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