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Reviewer's report:

Comments to the Author

I appreciate the revisions the authors have made. I have only a few technical queries remaining.

Minor comments:

Comment: Methods. I suggest put the Sample size and Measurements reproducibility as separate sections of statistical analysis. Additionally, all information about sample size calculation needs to be together in the Sample size section (included the final number of teeth).

Comment: Statistical analysis. Thank you for clarifying the point around regression analysis. However, I am still not entirely sure what was done here. How the logistic regression was performed? Did all variables enter in the model? These points need to be addressed to clarify the information for the reader. The values of OR and CI 95% should be added on the table. As I requested in the las review, the author should remove the lines among the variables and the lateral lines. Also, I suggest put the test used in footnotes.

If the authors can clarify these points, I have no further comments on the manuscript. Well done in particular for constructively addressing the relevance and implications of the study.

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