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Reviewer’s report:

This is an interesting study that seems to have potential for guiding real-world clinical practice for bruxism. My recommendations are mainly in the areas of providing clarity and additional support for the significance of the study.

Major compulsory revisions:

1. Background, 4th paragraph: although this is interesting, it is not clear how this directly relates to the study. This is more about diagnosis, whereas the study focuses on treatment effectiveness.

2. Background, paragraphs 6-8 essentially seem like a detailed list of the different types of treatment. Although this is helpful, they could be tied together better. Also, these could be used to better set up the importance of the study. The last paragraph of the background section briefly mentions some limitations of prior work, but there are no references. I think the background section could be substantially strengthened by a clear and more detailed description of why this study was undertaken. For example: what is currently being done / not done in clinical practice - are both PT interventions used, but there’s no evidence about which one is better? Or if either are more effective than dental treatment alone? What are the specific evidence gaps that will be filled by this study?

3. The study aim is stated as comparing 2 PT interventions with dental treatment, but it is not clear what the hypotheses are. These should be stated. As noted above, it is not clear whether the primary hypothesis is comparing PT interventions to dental treatment or the PT interventions to each other.

4. Intervention section, 2nd paragraph, 1st sentence: it is not clear what the "third assessment" is. The justification for the handbook could also be clearer. (There is also a grammatical error in this sentence.)

5. The sample size calculation section is rather sparse. Which outcome(s) were used in the sample size calculation? Why was a 20% difference chosen? Was attrition considered?

6. The analysis section is also relatively sparse and does not address specific hypotheses (as alluded to above). Will baseline values be considered in the analysis of outcomes?

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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