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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?
Yes - appropriate statistical analyses have been used in the 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?
Probably - with minor revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: The authors have significantly improved the manuscript along with the changes mentioned in the script. However, they have not answered few of my very important questions.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:
I questioned whether salivary glands were assessed for their flow and muscles of mastication for their function?? The authors didn't provide any answer.
Which all non dental health care professionals were included?? Please explain properly.
I also asked why cancer was not included as a part of this study since this particular aspect is more important for evaluation by non dental health care professionals too. But this questions is also not explained.
Further do explain in the introduction section as to why the authors think that non dental health care professionals should be involved? Indeed this is important aspect to involve non dental health care professionals but please do explain the need in the introductions section so as to provide a strong base to the topic.

The authors were also asked for sentence forming errors and other mistakes. For example: The authors write in the Background section that "In addition, several barriers to dental care for older people are reported like the accessibility of dental practice may become problematic due to mobility problems and financial barriers. Moreover, other health issues and the lack of trust in dental care have a negative impact on older peoples' oral healthcare seeking behavior (4-6)." These barriers differ from country to country. The authors needs to be more precise while making such statements. Please do intimate the authors along with their country while making such statements. Further Lack of trust in dental care thus leading them to get evaluated form non dental health care providers does not seem to be a good fit for this study. So please check and correct such statements in the manuscript.

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 am able to assess the statistics

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