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Reviewer's report:

To the author.
This is an informative and nicely written manuscript but I have the following comments.

You mentioned that (DDE) is an abbreviation of developmental defects of enamel. You should mention what is (DDEs) before you use it for the first time.

Material & method
A. Photographic method;
1. You should have standardize the photo magnification for all the samples.
2. If the examiners discussed the conditions, when there is a difference in coding, until they reach agreement then Kappa should be 1.00 for all inter examiner measures.

B. How long was the duration of the study? Measuring intra examiner reliability after one year seems to be strange.

Results;
Table 3, you should mention the number of examined teeth. How was the number and percentage of teeth with DDE out of all examined teeth is 115 (16%). If 90 children were examined and each one has 4 incisors, then total should be 360 teeth. 115 out of 360 is not 16%.

Using this method, it is really confusing to score the tooth when it has more than one DDE. The WHO index (1997) is more reliable because the combination of any two or even three lesions is given a specific score and give more reasonable statistical analysis.

You said you combined the similar subcategories. Where did you put score number 6?
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