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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? Yes
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? Yes
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
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? No
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? Yes
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? Yes
9. Is the writing acceptable? Yes

Minor Essential Revisions

Line 51: the uppercase letters should be used in the name of the index.

Lines 201 and 284-5: I suggest adding the term ‘cavitated’ because the context of the sentences refers to such kind of lesions.

Line 209: the character % is missing.

Line 317: probably the term ‘dmft’ is missing.

Line 392: the volume number is missing.

Discretionary Revisions

Authors claimed that this was the first paper comparing the data obtained by the CAST and WHO criteria. However, there is a paper published in Eur J Paeditr Dent 2014, 15, 107-112 by Baginska J, Rodakowska E and Kierklo A. titled Status of occlusal surfaces of first permanent molars in 6-8-year-old children evaluated by the CAST and DMF indices. In my opinion, it is worth referring to this paper in the discussion.
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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