

DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN SOURCE DOCUMENT AND COMMON BACK TRANSLATION

Overall, when both back-translated versions of the BruxScreen-Q and BruxScreen-C were compared with the original instruments, they were found to be highly similar. Only minor wording and stylistic differences were identified, none of which were considered to have a relevant impact on the meaning, interpretation, or clinical applicability of the items. The following points summarize the observed differences and the decisions made:

1. Use of “assess” versus “evaluate”

In the general explanation section, one back-translator used the verb *evaluate* instead of *assess* to describe the purpose of the questionnaire. As both terms are interchangeable in clinical and research contexts, this difference was considered stylistic, and the original wording was maintained.

2. Description of bruxism manifestations

The expression *can manifest in two different forms* was back-translated as *may present in two distinct forms* by one translator. As both formulations convey the same concept regarding bruxism expression, this variation was considered acceptable and without conceptual impact.

3. Characterization of bruxism as a harmless activity

One back-translated version described bruxism as *generally considered a harmless activity*, whereas the original version stated *bruxism is a harmless activity*. The difference was interpreted as a minor linguistic adjustment reflecting scientific caution, and the original wording was retained.

4. Instructional wording to respondents

The phrase *We kindly ask you to complete the questionnaire* was backtranslated as *We kindly request that you complete the questionnaire*. This modification was considered a polite stylistic variation, with no effect on meaning or respondent understanding.

5. Frequency adverbs in questionnaire items

In several items, *How often* was back-translated as *How frequently*. As both expressions are commonly used and equivalent in self-reported frequency questions, this difference was considered purely stylistic.

6. Description of temporal occurrence

The sentence *Both forms may occur during sleep and during wakefulness* was backtranslated as *Both forms may occur both during sleep and wakefulness*. This reordering of terms did not alter the meaning and was therefore considered acceptable.

7. Description of mandibular symptoms

The term *limitation of mouth opening* was backtranslated as *restricted mouth opening*. Both expressions are widely used in the literature on temporomandibular disorders and were considered conceptually equivalent.

8. Observation of facial features in the clinical form

In the clinical assessment section, *the facial contour is observed* was backtranslated as *the facial contour is evaluated*. As both terms accurately describe the same clinical action, this difference was deemed stylistic.

9. Examiner instructions regarding tooth wear

The phrase *please indicate whether the observed wear is* was back-translated as *please specify whether the observed wear is*. This variation did not affect the instruction given to the examiner and was considered linguistically equivalent.

10. Overall impact of translation differences

None of the identified differences affected the conceptual framework, scoring system, response options, or clinical interpretation of the BruxScreen instruments. Therefore, full semantic, conceptual, and clinical equivalence with the original versions was preserved.

11. Use of “possible” versus “potential”

The expression *possible presence* was backtranslated as *potential presence*. As both terms convey the same meaning in this context, this difference was considered purely lexical and without conceptual impact.

12. “Related” versus “associated” mandibular symptoms

The term *related mandibular symptoms* was rendered as *associated mandibular symptoms* in the back-translation. This modification was deemed acceptable, as both terms are commonly used interchangeably in clinical research.

13. Description of masticatory muscle activity

The phrase *an activity of the masticatory muscles* was backtranslated as *an activity involving the masticatory muscles*. This variation did not change the underlying concept of bruxism and was therefore considered equivalent.

14. Intensity of clenching

The adjective *mild* was backtranslated as *light* when describing clenching intensity. This difference was regarded as stylistic and without impact on the interpretation of the item.

15. Description of clenching as a static activity

The expression *without movement* was back-translated as *without mandibular movement*. This change was considered a clarification rather than a conceptual modification.

16. Spatial description of mandibular movement

The phrase *relative to the maxilla* was back-translated as *in relation to the maxilla*. Both expressions were judged to be semantically equivalent.

17. Frequency descriptor of grinding sounds

The adverb *usually* was back-translated as *commonly* in the description of grinding sounds. This variation was considered a minor stylistic difference.

18. Description of consequences of bruxism

The phrase *may experience consequences* was back-translated as *may develop consequences*. As both formulations indicate the same clinical possibility, the difference was considered acceptable.

19. Description of jaw pain

The term *jaw pain* was rendered as *pain in the jaw*. This rephrasing did not alter the clinical meaning of the symptom.

20. Description of muscle stiffness

The expression *stiffness of the masticatory muscles* was backtranslated as *masticatory muscle stiffness*. This modification was considered a syntactic adjustment with no conceptual implications.