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Reviewer's report:

Minor Essential revisions

There are some typographic errors in the text, e.g. 2nd paragraph introduction, 3rd line before the end, “is the ability to archive Methods and Materials: Visual Dental Examination, 2nd paragraph debrissterilization

In the whole of the text photographs should be referred to as digital photographs

Title: This is a very long, could be revised as shorter to "Comparison of intra-oral digital photographs with visual caries examination for primary and permanent teeth: cross sectional study"

Abstract: Format of aim not to include the study design. Aim to agree with that of the main text.

The Aim of the study and objectives are inadequate. Objectives to be revised to include: a) the intra rater reliability for all examiners, b) inter examiner reliability for each methods, and c) agreement between the examination methods

Method: More details to be given for the photographic procedures and Assessments. regarding the use of intraoral camera, its analysis, magnification and photographic reproducibility.

Results: In the last paragraph, to add which test was used to found the level of agreement reported.

Discussion: There is a repetition of results in the first paragraph.

It would be interesting for the authors to comment in the discussion regarding the possible use of this photographic method with a more detailed caries clinical examination system, such ICDAS which is so commonly used.

Tables and Figures: Legends need to be more specific and informative.

Table 1, presents the ICC and not the dmft/DMFT and should be revised accordingly.

In the reference list, the reference Boye et al (in press) in the last paragraph of the discussion, does not appear.
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.