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Requested Revision

Abstract

1. * It is not clear in the abstract how many individuals were involved and their age range. Please include this information, as this would increase the readability of the manuscript.
   
   Information on the individuals involved and their age has been added (ref. lines of the manuscript from 58 to 59).

2. * Among the health care professionals, who would benefit most with this tool? This is not clearly demonstrated in the abstract
   
   This tool can be used by nurses to assess the health of the oral cavity in elderly subjects also with cognitive deficit (ref. lines of the manuscript from 68 to 69).

3. * It is not clear with the questionnaire was self-applied or not.
   
   We did not consider that the questionnaire was self-applied because the questionnaire must be administered by the nurses.
Background

1. * Overall, the background section is well-written, but rather long.

The background section has been shortened.

2. * First paragraph (2nd sentence): The cited references does not fully align with the sentence. Please consider to include a reference that involved older individuals, such as "Colaço, J, Muniz, FWMG, Peron, D, Marostega, MG, Dias, JJ, Rosing, CK, Colussi, PRG. Oral health-related quality of life and associated factors in the elderly: A population-based cross-sectional study.. Cien Saude Colet [periódico na internet] (2019/Apr).

The reference has been added (ref. Lines of the manuscript n. 79).

3. * Page 6 (2nd paragraph): Is this paragraph (MPS index) necessary to understand the whole manuscript? Please consider remove it.

MPS removed.

4* Page 6 (last paragraph): The first three sentences are repetitive: "Many studies have shown that oral health has a significant impact on the quality of life, especially for older adults (2, 3, 4) (…)". Consider remove it.

The sentences removed.

Methods

1. * Overall, the translation/validation process are appropriate. However, in phase V is not clear what the authors mean by "ten experts". Experts in what?

Ten nurses are expert in long-term care (ref. lines of the manuscript from 201 to 202).

2. * Why was the tool reassessed only by the experts? Why were the nurses not involved in this process again?

This is required by the validation model (ref. lines of the manuscript from 228 to 229).

3. * Phase VI needs further explanation? How was the tool applied? Please give further details.

For further details, please refer to the manuscript, lines from 223 to 226.
4. * Figure 1 uses Arabic number, but within the text Roman numbers are used. Please align it.

The numbers have been aligned.

5. * For the "sample in Phase V", please explain the randomization process and the total number of nurses in each institution.

The randomization process has been explained (ref. lines of the manuscript from 231 to 243).

6. * In data analysis, what "AVE" means?

The meaning of AVE has been better specified (ref. lines of the manuscript from 268 to 270).

7. * The validated tool (in Italian) per se is not demonstrated in the manuscript. Additionally, the number of question and dimension/scale need further explanation in order to be understood. This include the 12 translated questions and the 6 other questions.

We did not understand the request for further explanations

Results

* Table 1 and 2: it is not clear why there is absence data for question 18.

Data for the question are present.

Discussion

1. * The results for "dental pain" were low for all results. Discuss it.

The lowest score, although sufficiently saturated with factor 2 in the factor analysis, concerns dental pain; this is the only item on the scale that concerns a symptom and that it must be reported by the subject that, if suffering from cognitive deficits, he is sometimes unable to express it (ref. lines of the manuscript from 353 to 356).

2. * The Discussion is very short. The applicability of the tool must be discussed. Additionally, its clinical relevance, strengths and weakness must be discussed.

The Discussion has been extended with the required additions it (ref. lines of the manuscript from 371 to 381).
Conclusion

* Avoid references in this section, and try to be straight to the point. There is also a repetition of sentences detected in the Introduction section.

References have been removed.