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Reviewer’s report:

Dear Authors,

Thank you for your efforts.

Please find my comments:

METHODS

Page 5:

- Line 44-49: the details you mentioned here are usually presented in the results. So I suggest you move it to Results.

- Line 51-54: you wrote "presence of adequate support tissue health, and adequate capacity to answer the questionnaire". These these two points need to be more specific. The are very general now... please define "adequate" and make it more measurable.

Page 6

- First line: you wrote "New prostheses were made for the patients". Were the dentures made by the same dentist? or various dentists? Please mention this... Could this in any affect the quality of the denture and hence the patient experience?

- Line 6: I suggest using the term "insertion" instead of the term "installation"

RESULTS

Line 32: here you may add the paragraph from Methods which mentioned those who did not continue and how the number went down from 50 patients to 41. Also, the reader needs to know more about the characteristics of the participants.... age range, socioeconomic status, level of self-care...etc.
DISCUSSION

I believe you had a balanced and reasonable discussion. Thank you for that

FIGURES

I could not check Fig 1 and Fig 2 because they did not show up in the PDF

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

Yes

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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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