

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_76691
Title of the Manuscript:	Clinical Trial of the Canary System for proximal caries detection: A Comparative Study
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>It is an interesting study that compares a new method of caries detection comparing it with conventional diagnostic methods.</p> <p>From a methodological point of view, it is well structured and meets the criteria of a scientific method.</p> <p>The theoretical framework is in accordance with the subject. The objectives and the hypothesis of the work are clearly stated.</p> <p>The methodology used is rigorous and is well explained in each of its parts. In relation to the data of the "Adjustment of the Visual Examination (ICDAS) Data to Serve as Reference Standard". Although they are important from the methodological point of view, they are not relevant for the study in general, it is suggested to synthesize the information and place it in the manuscript in a summarized way.</p> <p>The results are presented in tables in clear form.</p> <p>The discussion and the conclusion are made according to the results obtained.</p> <p>it is a good work that provides evidence for the detection of cavities.</p> <p>Through the manuscript put some comments and doubts to the authors.</p> <p>Comments from manuscript</p> <p>1. "To be included in the study, the subject had to be at least 18 years of age and have at least 12 teeth erupted above the gum level." This criteria is not understood, at the age of the participating subjects, all teeth are erupted. Except in some cases due to age, the third molars may not be erupted.</p> <p>2. In relation to the data of the "Adjustment of the Visual Examination (ICDAS) Data to Serve as Reference Standard". Although they are important from the methodological point of view, they are not relevant for the study in general, it is suggested to synthesize the information and place it in the manuscript in a summarized way.</p> <p>3. Please clarify this data, in previous paragraphs, the authors speak of 30 recruited subjects and here they speak of 50 screened subjects, which finally remained in 33 who met the inclusion criteria.</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>This is a unique article that is of interest to both the dentist/dental researchers, the Biostatisticians that conducts statistical analysis for dental researchers, and the Physicists that develop the new technologies for caries detection. The mathematical sequence through which the 'adjustment of the visual exam data to serve as a Reference standard' was performed is the most important part of this article. This is the reason why we choose to publish it in a multidisciplinary journal like this journal of applied science and technology, and not in a purely dental journal/clinical journal. If we are to synthesize it and present the summary, we need to give the readers a reference paper, where they will see the full mathematical sequence, but this is the first time such adjustment was performed, so our publication will serve as a reference article for other biostatisticians/researchers to use in their future dental researches and publications. Although the dentists/dental scientists may not fully understand the mathematical part of the article, the Biostatisticians and Physicists will understand it,</p> <p>Furthermore, if we synthesize the information and present it as a summary without giving a reference, the readers, especially the Biostatisticians and the Scientists, will not understand how it was performed, and as such our publication would not have a high strength.</p> <p>Please we would be very grateful if you should pardon us, and publish this manuscript with the full mathematical sequence of performing the adjustment.</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>This statement has been amended to ".....at least 12 teeth to ensure an adequate number of surfaces for caries detection."</p> <p>Responded above.</p> <p>This was wrongly written, and has been amended in the manuscript. It was calculated that 30 subjects will provide the required sample size, but 33 were recruited to make room for dropouts. We screened 50 subjects to be able to get 33 qualifiers.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	