CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A (Excellent)	[ ] Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[Y] Grade B (Very good)	[Y] Grade B: minor language polishing	[ ] Existed	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C (Good)	[ ] Grade C: a great deal of	[ ] No records	
[ ] Grade D (Fair)	language polishing	BPG Search:	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade E (Poor)	[ ] Grade D: rejected	[ ] Existed	[ ] Minor revision
		[ ] No records	[Y] Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This article reviews the use of cone-beam CT in periodontology. The authors had contrasted the pros and cons of this 3D imaging modality against conventional 2D radiographs and medical CT. Comparison had been made in terms of the trade-off between image quality, technical configuration, radiation exposure, cost and availability. It went on to review major clinical applications of these techniques in the study of diagnosis and treatment response. The piece would be an important contribution to the literature in this field. The contents of this review appeared to be comprehensive and balanced. However, many of interesting points were buried in the text and not easily seen from the readers' perspective. This article should be improved further before it can be considered for publication. As a manuscript in radiology it is important that the paper includes some images, photos or graphs to visually demonstrate the salient features discussed in the text. A review article is meant to synthesize the recent progress in scientific research in a highly informative manner, given that the goal is to educate the students and investigators in a particular area. To this end, the use of table, list, or box is encouraged to summarize, support, or expand information presented in text. Provide a Title for each of these items. This can be simply a text box of short paragraphs or a list of itemized bullets to assist the readers in grasping the essence of the review. Such items can be used to complement or summarize the lengthy discussions in each of subsections in the manuscript. The section of the final conclusion has to be expanded to elaborate on all major topics covered in this article.   p.3: the correct name should be 'Mayo Clinic Biodynamic Research Laboratory'

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Radiology
ESPS Manuscript NO: 8344
Title: The Use of Cone Beam Computerized Tomography in Periodontology
Reviewer code: 00742323
Science editor: Zhai, Huan-Huan
Date sent for review: 2013-12-26 14:40
Date reviewed: 2014-01-23 20:06

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A (Excellent)	[ ] Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B (Very good)	[Y] Grade B: minor language polishing	[ ] Existed	[ ] High priority for
[Y] Grade C (Good)	[ ] Grade C: a great deal of	[ ] No records	publication
[ ] Grade D (Fair)	language polishing	BPG Search:	[ ]Rejection
[ ] Grade E (Poor)	[ ] Grade D: rejected	[ ] Existed	[ ] Minor revision
		[ ] No records	[Y] Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting review article about a recent, current and relevant subject to the area. However, this scientific literature review would be more understandable and pleasant to read if it had tables and graphs, for example. Moreover, would be also interesting some CBCT images to improve the quality of this review.   The first sentence of Abstract is a repetition of a sentence in the Introduction. However, it should not be referenced.   In section: "Radiological Evaluation of Periodontal Tissues:", the authors wrote that "Mengel et al. demonstrated that digital volume tomography scans were better in detection of periodontal defects compared with conventional radiographs and medical CT [21]". For clarity the text, the authors should better explain what are these digital volume tomography scans   The conclusion says that "...CBCT applications provide obvious benefits in periodontics, although it should be used only in right indications considering the necessity and the potential radiation hazards of the examination.". I think it would be better if the authors cite what are these right indications for CBCT in the conclusion

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Radiology
ESPS Manuscript NO: 8344
Title: The Use of Cone Beam Computerized Tomography in Periodontology
Reviewer code: 00563599
Science editor: Zhai, Huan-Huan
Date sent for review: 2013-12-26 14:40
Date reviewed: 2014-02-12 06:15

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A (Excellent)	[ ] Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B (Very good)	[Y] Grade B: minor language polishing	[ ] Existed	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C (Good)	[ ] Grade C: a great deal of	[ ] No records	
[Y] Grade D (Fair)	language polishing	BPG Search:	[Y] Rejection
[ ] Grade E (Poor)	[ ] Grade D: rejected	[ ] Existed	[ ] Minor revision
		[ ] No records	[ ] Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a narrative review about use of cone beam tomography in Periodontology. I think a systematic review will be better for the Journal. But the weak point is the discussion section. This manuscript does not have a discussion. I recommend the authors include a discussion section and include the advantages of the cone beam in the periodontal research.