

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>)

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		
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>The paper is an original investigation into the efficacy of the commercialized Canary method system for detecting proximal caries in a clinical setting compared to bitewing radiography</p> <p>The Authors made a great work in terms of methodology and the paper sounds scientific and well written. The only problem I find is the statistical analysis It seems to me complex, and I do not feel able to determine whether it is correct or not.</p> <p><b>The summary</b> is complete, concise and clear. Although they are familiar acronyms they should be explained ICDAS-II Scoring System</p> <p><b>Introduction:</b> is correct</p> <p><b>Materials and methods</b> are clear and well explained The authors make a great effort to explain their novel method of analysing the results.</p> <p><b>Results</b> are easy to understand. Why do authors record variables such as ethnicity and caries rate that are not analysed in the results?.</p> <p><b>Conclusions</b> are concise and clear.</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>The acronym, ICDAS-II has been written in full when first mentioned in Abstracts and Manuscript. The ICDAS-II scoring criteria were also described in section 2.2.1 (Conventional Visual Examination).</p> <p>Thanks</p> <p>We calculated the ethnicity data from the demographic information we collected, and we calculated the percentage of subject population in each caries risk status from the Caries risk assessment we performed. I have transferred the calculated data from section 2.1 (Study Population....) to the ‘Result’ section.</p>

[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>	