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Minor Essential Revisions
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Madhu Wagle, Tordis A. Trovik, Purusotam Basnet, Ganesh Acharya

2nd Review: Svetlana Tikhonova

After the first revision of the manuscript was improved and all my comments and suggestions were addressed. However there are some other issues that should also be managed:

1. Abstract
In the conclusion it is mentioned that Nepalese dentists had less CARIES PREVALENCE. However, the caries prevalence for both groups was not reported in the manuscript, only caries experience. Actually it is worth to calculate and report caries prevalence.

2. Lines 110-111: ‘Community Periodontal Index of Treatment Needs (CPITN) index was used….’
Remove word ‘index’ after (CPITN)

3. Line 130: ‘The diagnosis criteria and coding of the dental status….’
Include word ‘caries’ - dental CARIES status

4. Line 151: Re-write the sentence: ‘From after every meal to never…’

5. Discussion
Lines 227-229: ‘The reason behind the less number of carious and higher numbers of restored teeth among the dentists compared to the laypersons could be due to better oral hygiene or more frequent dental visits and treatment when indicated.’
If it is due to ‘better oral hygiene’ why then dentists have more fillings? If dentists regularly brush their teeth with fluoridated tooth paste we should expect that they will have less cavitated lesions and less restorations… It seems that the reason of having more fillings might be because of more frequent dental visits and better access to care. The overtreatment might be also the reason.
Check the prevalence of caries disease between two groups.


7. Line 251: ‘Although dental caries was relatively more prevalent…’
   The prevalence of caries was not reported in the manuscript.

8. Among limitations may be also: the caries lesions were detected form cavitated diagnostic threshold, thus the non-cavitated lesions were not taken into account.

9. Conclusions:
   See my comment #1 (caries prevalence)
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