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Reviewer's report:

Dear Author

I read with interest your paper entitled "Longitudinal study of gastroesophageal reflux and erosive tooth wear" it is a well written paper and your results support the conclusions.

I have some questions that have necessarily be elucidated:

- Methods section: did your patients undergo esophageal manometry prior to undergo MII-pH? If yes please detail it.

- Methods section: wich type of MII-pH device did you use Ohmega MMS or pHversaflex - Medtronic?

- Methods section: when you reported normal value (Zerbib et al - REF 11) you defined those as European normal value. We do not have European normal value! Those are Belgian-French normal values and are in line with those previously described by Zentilin (Dig Liver Dis. 2006 Apr;38(4):226-32)

- Why did not you evaluate baseline impedance value (MNBI) and post-reflux swallowed induced peristaltic wave (PSPW) index in your patients. It may be helpful to better distinguish patients who had progression of erosions from those who did not [Frazzoni M, et al. The added diagnostic value of postreflux swallow-induced peristaltic wave index and nocturnal baseline impedance in refractory reflux disease studied with on-therapy reflux disease studied with on-therapy impedance-pH monitoring. Neurogastroenterol Motil. 2017 Mar;29(3)]. Please comment in the discussion session.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess
Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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