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"PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?

Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

No - there are minor issues

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

Yes - experiments and analyses were performed appropriately

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?

Yes - appropriate statistical analyses have been used in the study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

No - there are minor issues

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?

Maybe - with major revisions
GENERAL COMMENTS: Dear editor,

Thank you for the invitation to review the manuscript "Linguistic-cultural validation of the oral health assessment tool (OHAT) for the Italian context". This is an interesting study about linguistic-cultural validation of a tool to assess oral health for the Italian. Overall, it was detected that the tool presented a good reliability, with an appropriate Cronbach alpha. However, some important aspects of the study are highlighted and need to be improved in order to be further considered for publication. Mainly, the translated and validated tool need to be clearly demonstrated, as further studies may benefit for it. The validation process is well-explained, but the Phase VI needs further explanation. The Discussion section is very short.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

Abstract
* 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.
* Among the health care professionals, who would benefit the must with this tool? This is not clearly demonstrated in the abstract.
* It is not clear with the questionnaire was self-applied or not.

Background
* Overall, the background section is well-written, but rather long.
* 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, FWMM, 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).
* Page 6 (2nd paragraph): Is this paragraph (MPS index) necessary to understand the whole manuscript? Please consider remove it.
* 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.
Methods

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

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

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

* Figure 1 uses Arabic number, but within the text Roman numbers are used. Please align it.

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

* In data analysis, what "AVE" means?

* 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.

Results

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

Discussion

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

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

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.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

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

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

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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