



Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,
315-321 Lockhart Road,
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7939

Title: Can noninvasive treatments arrest the progression of non-cavitated carious lesions in dentin? A systematic review of clinical trials

Reviewer code: 00724129

Science editor: Qi, Yuan

Date sent for review: 2013-12-08 16:12

Date reviewed: 2014-01-03 05:11

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Very well written

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7939

Title: Can noninvasive treatments arrest the progression of non-cavitated carious lesions in dentin? A systematic review of clinical trials

Reviewer code: 00723730

Science editor: Qi, Yuan

Date sent for review: 2013-12-08 16:12

Date reviewed: 2014-01-14 21:38

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I consider the present manuscript to be a focused and well performed systematic review. I would, nonetheless, like to provide the following suggestions in order to further improve the quality of the manuscript: - To briefly expand the introduction section in order to further clarify and strengthen the relevance of the present review to the reader. - To include a search flow diagram. - To improve the discussion of results: for example, briefly discussing limitations (e.g. use of articles only in English) and their possible impact in the observed results. - To briefly expand the conclusion section, providing an integrated conclusion. Best wishes