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Reviewer's report:

Minor Essential Revisions
In the materials and methods section, please give details about the PWL< WL and QLF standardized photographs: end to end? Field of view: upper and lower jaws canine to canine. You may also refer to the figures.
Remove discussion from the result section regarding fluorosis distribution in the study population versus the overall population.
Why bonferoni was used is not a result.
NHANES is missing in your list of abbreviations

Discretionary Revisions
I suggest to add some information to figures 4 and 5. It would be nice to now the scores given (PWL and WL) or calculated (QLF) on these images and the clinical scores for comparisons. Can the analysis be shown as pseudo-color overlay in fig 4d) and 5d)?

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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