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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses one or several testable research questions? (Brief or other article types: is there a clear objective?)
Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?
Yes - the approach is appropriate

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with sufficient technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?
Yes - experiments and analyses were performed appropriately

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?
Not sure - I am not able to assess the statistics in this study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?
Yes - the author's interpretation is reasonable

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? If not, can further revisions be made to make the work technically sound?
Yes - current version is technically sound

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: Yes the authors have responded adequately to each of my questions and they have made changes pertinent to the queries. Overall the revised manuscript is sound while it still needs improvement as for as the language and sentence forming is concerned.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:
The authors must highlight as to what exactly they mean by the term measurement properties of Oral health assessment. Different readers can interpret it differently. So please introduce it well in the introduction/Background section properly.
The authors specify the word "Older people" in the material and method section of the abstract. What age range was considered old age group?

Write the full form of the COSMIN in the abstract first. All short forms must follow the full form first like ROAG, MDS etc.

The authors state that the most frequently assessed items within the oral health assessments were: lips, mucosa membrane, tongue, gums, teeth, denture, saliva, and oral hygiene. Whether salivary glands were assessed for their flow and muscles of mastication for their function??

Since the objective is to comment on the practice, policy and research.. the result as well as conclusion must highlight on all these precisely in the conclusion of the abstract too as the abstract need to stand alone too.

Line no. 26,27 and 28 needs reformation.

Since Covidence is a software which was used, write it properly as people may not be aware of this. Do discuss this in discussion too

Line 58 and 59: Which all non dental health care professionals were included?? Nurses, physiotherapists ...?? Please explain.

Line 64, 65 : Why cancer was not included as a part of this study. I feel this particular aspect is more important for evaluation by non dental health care professionals too. Please improve sentence formation.

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

Yes

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.

I recommend additional statistical review
Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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