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| **PART 1: Comments** | | |
|  | **Reviewer’s comment**  **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | **Author’s Feedback** (It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | **This manuscript is important to the scientific community as it emphasizes the relative efficacy of SMART over ART in the treatment of early childhood caries, a condition with major public health implications, this manuscript is significant to the scientific community. It supports the adoption of SMART in pediatric dentistry by offering unambiguous clinical evidence of its superior caries-arresting ability and durability through the use of a split-mouth case study design. The results add to the increasing amount of data supporting minimally invasive, kid- friendly restorative procedures that lessen discomfort and enhance the long-term health of the mouth. Additionally, this case offers useful perspectives for medical professionals operating in low-resource and community settings, where sustainable, cost-**  **effective, and efficient methods are crucial.** | We sincerely thank the reviewer for their encouraging and constructive comments. |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | ***Alternative Title: Effectiveness of Silver-Modified Atraumatic Restorative Technique Versus ART in Caries Management: A Case Report.*** | Title has been reframed accordingly:  Effectiveness of Silver-Modified Atraumatic Restorative Technique Versus ART in Caries Management: A Split Mouth Technique Case Report |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section?**  **Please write your suggestions here.** | **Suggestions for improvement:**   * **Background: Include one or two brief sentences at the outset emphasizing the importance of minimally invasive techniques and the burden of early childhood caries. This will support the significance of the SMART vs. ART comparison.** * **Clarity of methods: For greater scientific rigor, briefly describe the standards used to assess restoration integrity (such as visual, tactile, or standardized index).** * **Results detail: Rather than just presenting qualitative statements, think about including quantitative information as well, such as secondary caries scores, GIC integrity, or the presence or absence of pain, if available.** * **To reaffirm clinical relevance, include a brief closing statement. For example, "This case suggests that SMART may be a more reliable option for managing**   **early childhood caries, especially in community or pediatric settings."** | We sincerely thank the reviewer for the constructive suggestions regarding the abstract. The following revisions have been made:   * **Background:** Two opening sentences have been added to highlight the importance of minimally invasive restorative techniques and the burden of early childhood caries, thus strengthening the rationale for comparing SMART and ART. * **Methods clarity:** The abstract now specifies the criteria used to assess restoration integrity, including visual and tactile examination, alongside monitoring for secondary caries and presence or absence of pain at each follow-up. * **Results detail:** The results section has been expanded to include more precise clinical observations, such as marginal breakdown of the GIC restoration in the ART group and intact restoration in the SMART group, along with patient-reported absence of pain. * **Conclusion strengthening:** The conclusion has been revised to emphasize the wider clinical relevance, noting that SMART may be a more reliable option for managing early childhood caries, particularly in pediatric and community health settings. |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.** | **The goal, methodology, and results are all clearly stated in this scientifically sound manuscript. The results are consistent with the body of research showing that SMART is more effective than ART. It would be more scientifically valid, though, if it included**  **evaluation criteria, acknowledged the brief follow-up, and described the results as preliminary.** | We thank the reviewer for the positive assessment of the manuscript and for the constructive suggestions. The following revisions have been made to improve scientific rigor:   * **Evaluation criteria:** The methodology section has been updated to explicitly state the clinical criteria used for assessing restoration integrity (visual and tactile examination, secondary caries, and presence or absence of pain). * **Acknowledgement of follow-up period:** The manuscript now clearly acknowledges that the follow-up duration was limited to 6 months. * **Preliminary nature of findings:** The discussion and conclusion have been revised to describe the results as preliminary, emphasizing that further studies with larger samples and longer follow-up are needed to validate these findings. |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional**  **references, please mention them in the review form.** | **The references are sufficient and relevant, but adding 3–4 recent (2020–2024) high-impact studies, guidelines, or systematic reviews will strengthen the scientific rigor, make the manuscript more up-to-date, and appeal to reviewers and editors.** | We thank the reviewer for this valuable suggestion, corrections have been made accordingly. |
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| **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?** | **Can be improved** | We thank the reviewer for pointing this out. We have carefully revised the manuscript to improve the clarity, grammar, and overall flow of the language. The text has been refined to ensure that it meets the standards required for scholarly communication. |
| **Optional/General** comments |  |  |
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| **PART 2:** | | |
|  | **Reviewer’s comment** | **Author’s Feedbac k** (It is mandator y that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
| **Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?** | ***(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in detail)***  **There are no ethical issues in this manuscript. Written informed consent was obtained from the patient’s guardian for publication of anonymized clinical details and images. Institutional ethical approval was also secured in accordance with international standards. These statements fulfill the necessary ethical requirements for a case report.**  **.** | We thank the reviewer for confirming that the ethical aspects have been adequately addressed. |