### General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal’s peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of ‘**lack of Novelty**’, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

### Compulsory REVISION comments

This is an interesting review article and the authors have done extensive data search. The title seems appropriate. Somehow, I feel that the abstract does not need any sections (Aim, materials and methods, results, conclusion) since this structure has not been followed in the main body. Furthermore, in my opinion, the manuscript has some shortcomings in regards to language, presentation, flow of information, and grammar. Given these shortcomings, the paper requires major revisions in terms of editing and proofreading. Below, I have provided numerous remarks along with suggestions to help improve the quality of manuscript.

1. **There are language and clarity issues.**
   - **P 1, L9**: Methods: A thorough literature search on S.mutans was performed and the relevant datas supporting its association to dental caries were extracted.
     - **Suggestion:** data is plural.
   - **P 1, L38**: By virtue of its contribution to the formation of the dental biofilm matrix, its capacity to produce large quantities of organic acids, and its propensity to outcompete non-cariogenic commensal species at low pH conditions.\[6\]
     - **Suggestion:** The sentence lacks clarity. Kindly, reframe it.
   - **P 3, L114**: It a mechanism of ecological importance as S.mutans manages to adapt to the changing environments, originating from different selective pressures.
     - **Suggestion:** Revise this sentence to enhance clarity.
   - **P 4, L151**: The findings of the study were, although these strains belonged to the same serological group (serotype c) with expression of the same biochemical, adhesive, and cariogenic properties as well as similarity in 90% of their genes the strains presented eight variable regions with more than 30 genome rearrangements
     - **Suggestion:** This sentence is difficult to understand and lacks clarity, kindly revise for better readability.
   - **P 5, L182**: This enzyme catalyses the synthesis of glucans from sucrose and are is encoded by gtf genes.
     - **Suggestion:** Revise this sentence.

Look out for other such ambiguous sentences in the manuscript and revise them for better flow of information and logic.

2. **There are many punctuation errors (like missing commas) and spacing errors.**
   - **P 2, L43**: colonizing S.mutans
   - **P 3, L92**: S.mutans belong to
   - **P 3, L95, L96**: variation than another species present in humans and is classified into four serotypes (c, e, f, and k).\[18\] Use of polymerase chain reaction (PCR)
   - **P 3, L140**: In 2002 the complete genome sequencing (Comma missing after 2002)
   - **P 1, L41**: However S.mutans can be isolated from individuals either with or without a
### Minor REVISION comments
If possible, add more keywords.
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<th>Reviewer’s comment</th>
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As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.
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