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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
Dear authors,

The aim of the comments that follow is to improve the quality of the work presented.

Overall, the topic is of great interest, but I the english needs to be improved. Some examples:

abstract: line 39 …scores “in of”…

Introduction: line 57 …”in in”…; line 64..”that evaluate measures; line 100…”some researchers have conducted researchers”…

General comments:
- Why the term socioenvironmental is used? Apparently, the information collected regards to what usually is described in the literature as socio-economical variables.

Abstract:
Line 41: when authors describe carious lesions are they including enamel lesions as well?

Introduction:
Line 69: Add for which age group the AUQUEI was developed and whether it was already validated into Portuguese. These information are present in the text, but not properly placed.

Observe that two aims are presented in the last paragraph. Therefore, the last sentence of the previous paragraph can be excluded, as it refers also to objectives.

Methods:
Line 152: it is not possible to evaluate the DMFT. DMFT is just a way to express the carious status of an individual. This sentence should be rephrased.

Lines 164-167: This part should be included in the introduction session

Lines 192- 196: Explain the rationale of doing this categorization
Results:
It is important to include the population caries prevalence and the prevalence of the D/d component.

Lines 250- 254: It is not clear whether the children who presented with the worst QoL scores presented all the conditions described or whether just presenting one of them, such ‘being a female’ was enough to make them be allocated in this category.

Line 255: a major concern when reading this paper was related to how the authors controlled the confounding factors, as the AUQUEI scores are also influenced by diseases not related to oral health problems.

What about the results regarding the DAI analysis?

Discussion:
Lines 294- 297: The results are not discussed. Which is the mean of these outcome?

The mean DMFT score of the population was not high, and no information about caries prevalence is provided. There is no explanation about confounding factors. In which extent the authors do believe that one cavitated tooth could explain the results?

Tables:
Table 1: Why both mean and median are used? What about the data distribution: normally or not distributed?
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