

NO	SECTION	LINE	COMMENTS
1	BACKGROUND	45-103	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In general, Background of this manuscript is too long.</li> <li>- The background should help the reader understand why the study is important.</li> <li>- The authors should explain why the study is being carried out with clear rationale.</li> <li>- The authors should explain the differ of this study from other work</li> </ul>
		99-100	<p>The authors wrote: <i>The primary objective of this review was to comprehensively assess the existing literature on the application of silver diamine fluoride (SDF) as a treatment modality for enamel caries.</i></p> <p>In background we could not find the reason why the authors focused the study only for enamel caries.</p>
2	MAIN BODY		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In general, this parts is too long, it is better to shorten the explanation of reference used</li> <li>2. It is better to explain the mechanism of action of SDF in the beginning of this part</li> <li>3. The authors just wrote what other authors have written. The authors should interpreting, critiquing and analysing their ideas</li> </ol>
3	FIGURE		<p>Figure 1: The Figure is confusing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In the top of Figure 1: “SILVER DIAMINE FLUORIDE” Why? This diagram is about the effect of fluoride, silver nitrate and silver diamine, not just talking about SDF.</li> <li>- The effect of fluoride, silver nitrate and silver diamine is not clear in that diagram.</li> <li>- Explanation of diagram C: not complete. Please check</li> </ul>