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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for asking me to review the article. My comments and suggestions are below.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
The research question is original, easily identifiable and well understood.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
There some incomplete sentences in the first paragraph of the methods
Paragraph 1 line 2 – Dentistry ……..
Paragraph 1 line 4 – the name of the city was not included.
The authors did not explain if the dentist who examined the children was standardized on the examination of newly erupted and measuring of tympanic temperature.
Did the authors rely on oral information given by the mothers or there was a written birth document/record presented to the authors by the mothers with respect to the birth weight of the children?
What information were the authors interested in under the dental history?
What is the basis for making use of 27 items on local and systemic teething disturbances attributable to eruption?
The pilot test of the questionnaire on the mothers should be moved to the section under data recording.
The authors should explain how they ensured that good level of internal consistency was obtained during the pilot test of the questionnaire on the mothers.
The authors did not state when the mothers commenced the non pharmacological therapy.

Oral examination
Paragraph 1 line 4 – what is this initial sign of tooth eruption?
Did the mothers bring the children to the clinic for consecutive 8 days?
Paragraph 1 lines 5-6 – this is not clear. What about the signs and symptoms that could have occurred on the first two days of the 8 days. How did you obtain this information?
Paragraph 1 line 7 – What did the dentistry try to palpate on the alveolar ridge with the index finger.

Paragraph 1 line 10 – I suggest that the sentence “Body temperature was ………at every appointment” be moved to the section under Teething signs and symptoms.

Experimental groups
Paragraph 1 line 1 – “……..54 children were initially enrolled each group”. Was there another grouping after this?

Food for chewing – Here the authors explained that children in this group were those who had started eating solid food. I quite agree with this but comparing this group with those who have not started taking solid food may not be appropriate.

Paragraph 7 line 1 – “The next appointment was scheduled for each child”. What was this appointment for?

Result:
Paragraph 2 line 2 – the authors should state the most frequent disturbances observed.

Paragraph 5 lines 1 – 7 – “We defined …………………analysis of recovery” should be moved to the methods section this is not result

9. Abstract:
Methods –
Line 1 – “270” should be written in words.

Lines 3 -5 – “The five methods ------- food for chewing”. This sentence is not clear.

Results
Line 1 – I suggest this should be written as “two hundred and fifty four children with mean age 16 + 7.2 months completed the study”.

Line 5-6 – I suggest that this should be changed to “There was a significant difference in body temperature the day before and after eruption (p<0.001)

10. Is the writing acceptable?
The article should be reviewed by a native English speaker.
A major revision of the article should be done.