

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-55816

**Title: Photo bio modulation in Dentistry: Current Evidence and Future Directions**

### Recommendation:

Accept as it is .....

Accept after minor revision.....

**Accept after major revision .....**

Do not accept (*Reasons below*) .....

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality			✓	
Clarity			✓	
Significance	✓			

Reviewer Name: Dr. Sudheer Aluru

### *Detailed Reviewer's Report*

This is a narrative review on the use of Photobiomodulation (PBM) in dentistry. The topic is timely, relevant, and appropriate for dental science or laser medicine. The manuscript attempts to cover the mechanisms, clinical applications, and future directions of PBM.

However, it is currently a disorganized collection of information rather than a coherent, critical review. The structure is poor, the writing is often superficial and repetitive, and it lacks a clear analytical narrative. Significant reorganization, condensation, and critical synthesis are required.

### Major Comments

1. The abstract states a "comprehensive literature review" was conducted, but the manuscript provides no methodology. There is no information on the search strategy, databases used, inclusion/exclusion criteria, or the timeframe of the literature covered. The authors must add a dedicated "Methods" section detailing their review process.
2. The manuscript's organization is confusing and illogical. The "Clinical Applications" section (Section 3) is fragmented into many small, oddly titled subsections (a., b., c., d., e., f., g.) that overlap significantly. For example, "Tissue regeneration and healing" (e.) is separate from "PBM in soft tissue healing" (f.) and "Management of Alveolar Osteitis" (g.), though all discuss healing. This creates immense repetition.

# International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

*www.journalijar.com*

---

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

3. The text repeatedly states the same basic points ("PBM reduces pain," "PBM promotes healing") without providing depth or critical analysis. The "Mechanisms" section lists theories but does not synthesize them into a clear, understandable model for the dental reader. The "Future Directions" is a simple list without critical prioritization or discussion of feasibility.
4. The conclusion (Section 5) is poorly written, contradictory, and adds no value. It states PBM is "promising" but then says "more studies is needed before introducing... in the clinical practise." It fails to summarize the key evidence, highlight the main gaps, or provide a clear take-home message. It must be completely rewritten.

### Minor Comments

5. The English requires thorough editing. There are grammatical errors, awkward phrasing (e.g., "in the Conclusion,Photobiomodulation..."), and informal language.
6. Inconsistent terminology: PBM, PBMT, LLLT used interchangeably without early clarification.
7. Professional language editing is strongly recommended.