

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> 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>The summary is complete, concise and clear. Although they are familiar acronyms they should be explained ICDAS-II Scoring System</p> <p>Introduction: is correct</p> <p>Materials and methods are clear and well explained The authors make a great effort to explain their novel method of analysing the results.</p> <p>Results are easy to understand. Why do authors record variables such as ethnicity and caries rate that are not analysed in the results?.</p> <p>Conclusions are concise and clear.</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Iciar Arteagoitia
Department, University & Country	University of the Basque, Spain