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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?  
   Yes. It is clear.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?  
   Subjects, study material, examination protocol, validation, and the statistical analyses are appropriate and well described.

3. Are the data sound?  
   Yes.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?  
   Yes.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?  
   Yes, they are.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?  
   Yes.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?  
   Yes, they do.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?  
   Yes.

9. Is the writing acceptable?  
   Yes.

The study is very simple and clear, well designed and conducted. Additional material is clear. References are correct. The paper is of impact due to the need of showing and testing different options of teaching caries detection of early lesions.
I believe the paper does not need revision and can be published as it is.
The paper is of interest and well written and my recommendation is to publish it.

**Level of interest:** An article of outstanding merit and interest 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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