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**Reviewer’s report:**

I have only one comment to the revised manuscript that I regard as falling into a category of

<< Major Compulsory Revisions>> :

I still think that in the conclusion the standard of the visual examination used in this study should be specified, because such a generalized assumption about visual examination, as reads now, is very wrong.

I mean, in this study the visual inspection was performed in "field" conditions, i.e. under natural light, the teeth being wet. Such conditions have a tremendous impact on the quality of recordings, and the discriminatory ability of an examiner decreases a lot when the examination conditions are non-standartized. I imagine, if the standartized visual examination of the teeth had been performed the outcome could have been different.

Furthermore, the word "visual" should be added when referring to direct examination, to be very clear on what the authors talk about.

Apart from that, I do not have any other comments to this manuscript.

Kind regards,

Vita Machiulskiene
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