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OHEA-D-17-00192 Dental Care Use in Ontario: the Canadian Community Health Survey (CCHS)

This manuscript explores the association of dental care use in Ontario, Canada, with several factors, using data from former surveys. The data can be useful to explain differences in dental care services. I found this manuscript interesting and potentially useful for administrators and oral care decision makers.

There are several issues with the methodology that prevent a proper evaluation, hence, the manuscript must detail the following issues before consider this manuscript for publication.

INTRODUCTION

1. Page 0 line 24 and rest of the manuscript: Change "prevalence of dental care use" to "frequency of dental care use" or "pattern..", since dental caries use is not a pathology.

2. Page 1 line 20: "in improving health outcomes among the general population," reference needed

3. Page 1 line 31 add something related that, even this usually recommended, there is no evidence showing any difference between people who attend regularly to dental checkups and who don't. See:


4. Page 2 line 32, reference 15. Cited research was not aimed to the statement declared in the manuscript, aimed to assess the impact of oral health on quality of life, not the effect nor
importance of regular dental visits. In fact, there is no mention to visits or recall at all in the cited paper. Fix this. Major issue.

METHODS

5. The method section could be greatly improved if the manuscript follows the recommendation for the report of survey research from Kelley, K., Clark, B., Brown, V., Sitzia, J., 2003. Good practice in the conduct and reporting of survey research. Int J Qual Health Care 15, 261-266.

6. Provide a brief description of the research tool.

7. Include the description of the sampling design (target population (to whom these results can be extrapolated), the eligible population and source population) and the sample size calculation.


9. Provide information about the ethical clearance of this research.

10. Define clearly "poor dental care use".

11. Clarify which one was the dependent variable. Related to the previous issue, is not clear how was the classification, e.g. a person who attended regularly and also made an emergency visit.

12. Explain the rationality of the statistical analysis. Seems more appropriate to use an ordinal logistic regression with the dependent variable ordered from regular visit/good dental care use to irregular, only emergency and no dental care use, with regular visit as the reference value.

RESULTS

13. Omit "almost" and any opinion or declarative statement, and provide the exact number or percentage.

14. Check the journal style for the report of significant differences/associations: bold? asterisks?

15. Since is not clear the output, is difficult to interpret the results: the independent variables are risk factors for poor dental care use or indicators of poor dental care use. Clarify.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

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

No

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

Unable to assess

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:

Acceptable

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?
If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal.