

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology</a>
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> 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>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Eugenia Henriquez-D'Aquino</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Chile, Chile</b>