

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Methodology

Manuscript NO: 88458

Title: Current protocol to achieve dental movement acceleration and pain control with

Photo-biomodulation

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 00742049 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MSc

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Colombia

Manuscript submission date: 2023-09-25

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-10-27 04:37

Reviewer performed review: 2023-11-06 08:36

Review time: 10 Days and 3 Hours

	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C:
Scientific quality	Good
	[] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [Y] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [Y] Grade D: No creativity or innovation



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [Y] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[]Yes [Y]No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The author very briefly reviewed some of the literature and made a empirical conclusion which may not be valid or useful. For example, why the total energy recommended is 2.2 J per surface? Why wavelength is 810nm and not 780nm or 800nm? I suggest a major revision is needed before this manuscript could be reconsidered for publication