

## ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Radiology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 8394

**Title:** Recent Advances in Imaging Technologies in Dentistry

**Reviewer code:** 02503737

**Science editor:** Huan-Huan Zhai

**Date sent for review:** 2013-12-28 15:09

**Date reviewed:** 2013-12-29 13:54

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" 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"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. This review described not only the recent advances in dental imaging, but also basic X-ray pictures since Dr. Roentgen discovered it. Thus, I feel the title may not be appropriate. I recommend the title "Basics and Recent Advances in Imaging Technologies in Dentistry". 2. It is unclear why CBCT was particularly features in the manuscript. Despite it, there are no figures of CBCT at all. 3. In "Concern for radiation exposure", the authors should carefully check the radiation doses: 1) organ dose v.s. effective dose and, 2) mSv v.s. microSv. For what was the radiation dose estimation of CBCT? If the radiation dose of 87-206mSv as an effective dose for a patient, it is much higher than conventional CT. 4. Some pictures of MRI are needed, I think. SWIFT technique is still experimental, and it should be clarified that clinical application is limited so far. 6. Some pictures of US are needed. Since DIAGNOdent is a trade name, its provider should be provided. Also this technique does not use ultrasound, thus I think this new technique should be separately described.



## BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

### ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Radiology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 8394

**Title:** Recent Advances in Imaging Technologies in Dentistry

**Reviewer code:** 00569789

**Science editor:** Huan-Huan Zhai

**Date sent for review:** 2013-12-28 15:09

**Date reviewed:** 2014-01-29 00:42

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<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"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

it is a well-written review

## ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Radiology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 8394

**Title:** Recent Advances in Imaging Technologies in Dentistry

**Reviewer code:** 00742412

**Science editor:** Huan-Huan Zhai

**Date sent for review:** 2013-12-28 15:09

**Date reviewed:** 2014-02-10 16:29

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"/> Existing	<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"/> Existing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In general, this paper is well written. However, there are some minor concerns that detract from the overall effort. Among them are: 1. Radiation exposure should be referred to not only its dose but its range including eye, salivary gland, thyroid gland, and stomach of pregnant women. 2. Epidemiological or clinical aspect of use of each advanced imaging techniques in dental office and hospital should be mentioned.