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Reviewer's report:

Thanks to the authors because big datas always come with big statistical problems, big results and big discussions. Congratulations.

- Page 2 (inner) line 43: As the authors write on Conclusion part the should be ended with probabilities like "may or might"


- Line 88: 12 months to 360 months, so many thing could be happen in the life, lets read

- Page 4- 5, line 97,98: what do the authors mean with this sentence? If we understood the year 1997, that means 1997+13=2010 and the year was too old to the manuscript. If we understood 8327, the authors' data were 485?

- I am sorry again and again. Was this article a part of references 21 and 22?

- Line 101: But when authors take a p value 0.0001 or more the finding will be more meaningful which was supported by significant findings. Did the authors choose a p value like 0.0001 before the study?

- line 107: What was the number of HongKong population? According to the world bank statement nearly 7.5 million. Do 650 children reflect the population?

- Page 8, line 194: Weren't there an early birth or premature birth? Did the authors select these data from archives? Because some studies (Sahin F, International Journal of Paediatric Dentistry 2008; 18: 262-266, Fadavi S) declared that early birth or prematurely born babies had delayed tooth eruption. If so please declare that these data were obtained
just from 37-41 weeks but a result of this the authors cannot generalize the results to the population

- Page 9 line 211: What about the other 29 students? 241+244=485 There are too many number (8327, 7381, 470, 650, 685, 514, 668....) to learn data size of this study please simplify them

- Page 9 line 213: Higher weight were included or the participants were higher weight? Please write and discuss it

- Page 9 line 217: delete see and use"( )"

- Page 9 line 218 This data is an expected result. But when the authors give the results monthly it will be more interesting and more useful like "table 2" in Oznurhan et al, Time and sequence of eruption of permanent teeth in Ankara, Turkey pediatric dental journal 2016;26:1-7

- Page 12, line 291: and these results shows correlation with this sentence "This result may suggest that growth parameters in the early months of life when growth rate is fastest may affect the teething time.

- Page 14 line 336: Where there are reference? There are several parameters used in Pediatrics and when they take into account all measurements they show the percentiles in Pediatrics which shows the growth is enough/low or faster and the reference 36 is too old to say something on this patterns according to the developing technologies.

- Page 15 line 357: Please check abstract section
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

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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