PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Radiology*

Manuscript NO: 66053

Title: Artificial Intelligence in Dentomaxillofacial Radiology

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05742869

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Research Scientist, Surgeon, Surgical Oncologist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Kazakhstan

Author's Country/Territory: Turkey

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-20

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-23 06:38

Reviewer performed review: 2021-03-25 11:09

Review time: 2 Days and 4 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous

statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Name of Journal: World Journal of Radiology   Manuscript Type: EDITORIAL Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Dentomaxillofacial Radiology   1.Title. The title reflects the main subject of the manuscript. Taking into account the fact that   these days technologies related to artificial intelligence   demonstrate usefulness   in the medical area this topic sounds actual.   2 Abstract.   The abstract gives a description of work that was described in the manuscript.   3 Key words. Key words are selected appropriately.   4 Background. Introduction fully describes the present status and significance of the study.   5 Methods. Not applicable.   6 Results/ 7 Discussion. .   This editorial article contains several pieces of information about the usefulness of applying AI technologies in dentomaxillofacial Radiology and was written in a descriptive manner.   Also, the authors demonstrated their own point of view regarding the huge value of AI-based on scientific arguments, however, during the reading of this manuscript, it is a bit difficult to catch the main idea of the manuscript due to the absence of structural division of the manuscript text. I think it will be more appropriate to understand the main idea if authors divide the text of the manuscript into several sections with subheadings depending on the sphere of dentomaxillofacial radiology, where AI methods and technologies are used. In addition, due to the fact that authors indicated information regarding some drawbacks and limitations of AI technologies (for example, YOLO), which still require strict control and rechecking by physicians I suggest include additional information (examples from previous investigations) regarding some imperfections of AI technologies.   8 Illustrations and tables. Not applicable.   9 Biostatistics.   Not applicable.   10 Units. Not applicable.   11 References.   Authors tried to use and cite latest references, however they didn't give full critical evaluation of the selected sources of literature.   12 Quality

of manuscript organization and presentation. The text flow easy to read and understandable. 13 Research methods and reporting. Not applicable. 14 Ethics statements. Not applicable.