

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	<a href="#">Medicine and Medical Research: New Perspectives</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2746
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A Study to Evaluate the Prevalence of Golden Proportion and RED Proportion in Aesthetically Pleasing Smiles</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Book Chapter</b>

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	The manuscript addresses a relevant topic in aesthetic dentistry, focusing on measurable proportions like the Golden Proportion and RED Proportion. However, it underplays the importance of these findings for clinical practice. The paper could emphasize more clearly how these proportions could be practically applied or disregarded in actual treatment plans. Additionally, the study is limited by a relatively small and homogeneous sample size, reducing its generalizability to a wider population.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title is overly long and could be more concise. A suggested alternative title would be: "Evaluating Golden and RED Proportions in Aesthetic Smile Design." This title is clearer and more direct, capturing the essence of the study without unnecessary detail.	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	The abstract lacks a detailed discussion of the clinical relevance of the findings. It mentions the low prevalence of the Golden Proportion and RED Proportion but doesn't explain how this should influence clinical decision-making. Additionally, the statistical analysis is mentioned but not sufficiently explained in terms of its significance to the study's conclusions. The abstract could be revised to include a brief explanation of why the low prevalence of these proportions matters for dental practitioners.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	While the manuscript's structure is generally appropriate, the discussion section could be expanded to better differentiate between previous research and the current study's unique contributions. The results and discussion sections are somewhat repetitive, making it difficult to distinguish between raw data presentation and interpretation of the findings. A clearer delineation between these sections would improve clarity.	
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	The manuscript's scientific methodology is sound, but the study is limited by its sample size, which consists of students from a single dental college. This reduces the external validity of the findings. Furthermore, the statistical analysis, while accurate, could benefit from a deeper exploration of potential confounding factors like gender or ethnicity, which are not addressed in the study. Future studies should incorporate these variables for more nuanced results.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	The references are adequate but slightly outdated. The latest references seem to be from early 2000s, with few recent contributions. The manuscript would benefit from incorporating more current studies (from 2010 onward) to ensure that the discussion reflects the latest advancements in dental aesthetics.	

[Review Form2](#)

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Some language in the manuscript is awkward or unclear. For example, in the results section, phrases like "Golden Proportion existed in isolation in 3.9% of individuals" could be rephrased to something clearer such as: "The Golden Proportion was observed between the central and lateral incisors in only 3.9% of individuals, and in just 0.6% between the lateral incisors and canines."</p> <p>There are also occasional grammar mistakes and overly long sentences that could be broken down for easier understanding.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b>comments</p>	<p>The manuscript provides a valuable contribution by challenging traditional dental aesthetics, but it could be more impactful with a larger, more diverse sample size. Additionally, while the statistical tests are appropriate, the interpretation of results could be more detailed, specifically regarding how these findings should influence future dental practices. The manuscript would also benefit from further research that includes gender, age, and ethnicity as variables affecting aesthetic perceptions.</p> <p>Based on the provided manuscript, I don't immediately see any significant ethical concerns, but a few areas could benefit from clarification or improvements:</p> <p><b>Informed Consent:</b> The manuscript mentions that informed consent was obtained from participants, which is a key ethical requirement. However, it does not provide detailed information on how participants were informed about the study, the use of their photographs, and whether they were aware of how their data would be used in research publications. Clarifying this process and ensuring proper documentation of consent would strengthen the ethical soundness of the study.</p> <p><b>Privacy and Confidentiality:</b> Since the study involved photographing participants' smiles, maintaining the privacy and confidentiality of the subjects is essential. The manuscript should mention whether steps were taken to anonymize or de-identify the photographs to prevent the participants from being recognized. This is crucial for protecting personal data, especially in studies involving visual documentation.</p> <p><b>Participant Selection:</b> The manuscript appears to use a sample of dental students from a single college, which may raise concerns about voluntary participation and coercion. If these students felt pressured to participate due to their association with the institution, that could be an ethical issue. It would be helpful if the authors explicitly stated how participants were recruited and whether any measures were taken to avoid coercion.</p> <p><b>Ethics Approval:</b> The manuscript briefly mentions that approval was obtained from a governing body (Rajiv Gandhi University of Health Sciences). However, providing the specific ethics committee's name and reference number, along with the date of approval, would ensure transparency and adherence to ethical research standards.</p> <p>Addressing these points would help eliminate any potential ethical concerns and ensure that the study is ethically sound.</p>	

[Review Form2](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Treena Kabiraj</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Dental College Azamgarh, Atal Bihari Vajpayee Medical University, India</b>