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Reviewer's report:

The authors have largely addressed the comments I made in my previous review, although the text they have proposed to address comment # 1 (concerning a convenience vs purposeful sample) is not addressed in the revised text as far as I can understand. Perhaps my original observation was not clear enough. This is an important point that I believe needs clearly addressing in the manuscript. The point is that to validate any instrument we have to be clear on what the goal of the instrument is e.g. discrimination between groups; evaluation of change over time/with treatment etc. The sample then used to test the validity of the instrument is then based purposefully on that purpose e.g. if the goal of the instrument is to discriminate between groups with different levels of oral health problems, then a sample with known differences in levels of those oral health problems should purposefully been recruited. This was not the case in the work reported in this manuscript - as the authors state, it was a convenience sample. The authors need to clarify this approach and discuss the implications for the findings.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
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