



ISSN NO. 2320-5407

ISSN(O): 2320-5407 | ISSN(P): 3107-4928

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-57634

Title: **RADIOMICS RESEARCH IN ORAL AND MAXILLOFACIAL RADIOLOGY: A BIBLIOMETRIC ANALYSIS,**

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision.....

Accept after major revisionYES

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

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

Reviewer's ID: JPR-094

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Reviewer's Report

Overall Evaluation

The manuscript addresses an emerging topic involving radiomics, artificial intelligence, and oral/maxillofacial radiology using bibliometric methods. The subject is timely and potentially relevant for researchers interested in AI-assisted imaging applications in dentistry. However, the manuscript contains major methodological, structural, editorial, and originality-related weaknesses that significantly reduce its scientific quality and publication readiness. Extensive revision is required before reconsideration.

Strengths

1. ****Timely Research Topic****

* The manuscript focuses on radiomics and artificial intelligence in dentistry, which is currently an expanding research area.

2. ****Use of Bibliometric Approach****

* Application of bibliometric tools such as Biblioshiny and bibliometrix provides a quantitative overview of publication trends.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

3. **Visualization-Based Analyses**

* Inclusion of thematic maps, keyword co-occurrence analysis, and thematic evolution analysis enhances graphical representation of the field.

4. **Recent Literature Coverage**

* The study includes recent publications up to 2025, indicating updated literature inclusion.

5. **Interdisciplinary Relevance**

* The topic combines dentistry, radiology, artificial intelligence, and data science, increasing multidisciplinary interest.

Weaknesses

1. **Major Duplication in Introduction**

* Lines 21–45 and 46–70 are nearly identical repetitions.

* This reflects poor manuscript preparation and raises concerns regarding AI-generated or improperly edited text.

2. **Limited Novelty**

* Several bibliometric studies on artificial intelligence in dentistry already exist.

* The manuscript insufficiently explains how this study uniquely contributes specifically to radiomics literature.

3. **Weak Methodological Transparency**

* Search strategy lacks detailed reproducibility information.

* No explanation of screening workflow, reviewer agreement, threshold criteria, or clustering parameters.

4. **Single Database Limitation**

* Use of only Web of Science Core Collection may have excluded relevant studies indexed elsewhere.

5. **Superficial Data Interpretation**

REVIEWER'S REPORT

* Results are mainly descriptive.

* Advanced bibliometric indicators such as citation analysis, collaboration networks, productivity indices, or impact metrics are absent.

6. ****Language and Editorial Problems****

* Repetitive phrasing throughout the manuscript reduces readability.

* Several grammatical and formatting inconsistencies are present.

7. ****Reference Errors****

* Reference 4 contains corrupted author formatting, indicating inadequate proofreading or reference management issues.

8. ****Lack of Critical Discussion****

* Discussion largely repeats findings rather than critically interpreting them within the broader scientific context.

9. ****Absence of PRISMA-Style Flowchart****

* Screening and article selection process are insufficiently illustrated.

10. ****Potential AI-Assisted Writing Characteristics****

* Frequent repetitive expressions and duplicated paragraphs reduce confidence in originality and editorial quality.

Key Points Requiring Revision

Major Issues

* Remove duplicated introduction section entirely.

* Improve originality and clearly define the research gap.

* Expand methodological details for reproducibility.

* Include additional bibliometric indicators and statistical interpretation.

* Correct all reference formatting and citation inconsistencies.

* Improve language quality and reduce repetitive statements.

* Add detailed explanation of thematic clustering and network construction.

Minor Issues

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- * Improve figure legends and interpretation.
- * Clarify search date and database extraction process.
- * Standardize terminology throughout the manuscript.
- * Revise conclusion to provide practical implications and future directions.

Scientific Significance

The topic has moderate-to-high scientific relevance because radiomics and AI-based imaging are increasingly important in dental diagnostics and oral radiology. The manuscript may provide a useful preliminary overview of research trends in this niche field. However, due to methodological limitations, limited originality, and insufficient analytical depth, the current version does not yet provide strong bibliometric insight suitable for high-quality publication.

Recommendation

Decision: ****Major Revision****

Reasons for Recommendation

- * Significant duplication and editorial issues.
- * Weak methodological rigor.
- * Limited novelty compared with existing bibliometric studies.
- * Incomplete bibliometric analysis.
- * Insufficient critical interpretation of findings.
- * Reference and formatting inconsistencies.

The manuscript may be reconsidered after substantial revision addressing methodological transparency, originality, analytical depth, language quality, and structural corrections.

* ****Major Revision**** before acceptance.

The strongest issue in this manuscript is the ****duplicate Introduction section****, which alone can justify a major revision.

Justification for Major Revision

Manuscript: *Radiomics Research in Oral and Maxillofacial Radiology: A Bibliometric Analysis*

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Line No.	Issue Identified	Reason / Justification for Major Revision
7–13	Abstract lacks methodological depth	The abstract does not clearly mention search date, inclusion/exclusion workflow, bibliometric indicators, or analytical thresholds, reducing reproducibility and scientific transparency.
10–11	Single database limitation not justified	Reliance only on Web of Science Core Collection may omit relevant literature indexed in Scopus or PubMed, affecting comprehensiveness of bibliometric analysis.
11–12	Software versions questionable	R version “4.6.0” appears inconsistent because this version may not yet be officially stable/released, raising concerns regarding methodological accuracy.
21–45	Redundant and generic introduction	Introduction contains broad background statements without sufficient critical analysis or novelty regarding radiomics in oral and maxillofacial radiology.
45–70	Complete duplication of introduction paragraphs	Entire introduction section is repeated almost verbatim, representing serious editorial negligence, possible AI-generated redundancy, and high internal similarity. This alone justifies major revision.
34–39	Bibliometric methods insufficiently described	Important bibliometric parameters such as normalization methods, clustering algorithm, threshold selection, and visualization settings are absent.
40–43	Literature gap weakly established	Authors claim limited bibliometric evidence but do not critically compare their study with previously published AI/dentistry bibliometric analyses.
71–74	Ethical statement unnecessarily simplistic	Ethical exemption statement is brief and lacks institutional policy reference or bibliometric research reporting standard.
75–78	Search strategy incomplete	Search syntax lacks field tags, truncation strategy, Boolean structure explanation, and reproducibility details.
77–78	Search query may miss relevant studies	Important terms such as “dentomaxillofacial,” “oral radiology,” “panoramic imaging,” and “dental imaging” are absent, potentially limiting dataset coverage.
79–80	Exclusion criteria poorly defined	Criteria for excluding unrelated articles are subjective and no reviewer agreement process is described.
82–93	Methods lack statistical rigor	No mention of citation metrics, collaboration analysis, Lotka’s law, Bradford’s law, country productivity, or author impact analysis, making bibliometric evaluation incomplete.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Line No.	Issue Identified	Reason / Justification for Major Revision
87–92	Network analysis insufficiently explained	Clustering algorithm, minimum occurrence threshold, and validation of thematic clusters are not described.
94	Sample size relatively small	Only 210 publications over 8 years may indicate incomplete retrieval strategy or narrow search terms.
95–97	Results overly descriptive	Annual publication growth is merely described without statistical interpretation or contextual comparison with global AI/radiomics trends.
100–104	Keyword analysis superficial	Co-occurrence findings are descriptive and do not provide network metrics such as centrality, density, or modularity.
107–110	Trend analysis lacks quantitative evidence	Authors report thematic changes without providing statistical significance or frequency values.
114–117	Thematic map interpretation weak	Interpretation of motor/basic/niche themes is simplistic and lacks theoretical explanation.
120–123	Thematic evolution insufficiently validated	No explanation regarding time slicing method or thematic transition criteria used in Biblioshiny.
127–150	Discussion largely repetitive	Discussion restates results rather than critically interpreting findings or comparing with previous bibliometric studies.
135–150	Overgeneralized claims	Statements regarding increasing AI popularity are broad and unsupported by quantitative evidence from the presented dataset.
152–164	Interpretation lacks originality	Connections between AI, machine learning, and radiomics are already widely established and are not discussed in a novel context.
171–179	Thematic interpretation speculative	Statements regarding future importance of themes are speculative and unsupported by predictive bibliometric indicators.
188–193	Limitations inadequately addressed	Authors acknowledge limitations but fail to discuss impact of citation bias, database indexing bias, and language restriction on findings.
194–197	Conclusion too generic	Conclusion merely repeats results without providing practical implications, future bibliometric directions, or clinical significance.
206–207	Corrupted reference	Reference 4 contains severe author formatting errors

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Line No.	Issue Identified	Reason / Justification for Major Revision
	formatting	("Jacob ESoRcmoNEdSNBABAABCDCFV"), suggesting poor reference management and inadequate proofreading.
208–209	Possible citation inconsistency	Some 2025 references may be "online ahead of print" but publication details are incomplete.
Entire manuscript	Language repetitive and AI-like	Frequent repetitive phrases ("This finding suggests...", "Evaluation demonstrated...") reduce readability and indicate inadequate linguistic refinement.
Entire manuscript	Lack of PRISMA-style flowchart	Bibliometric studies generally include screening workflow diagrams for transparency; this is absent.
Entire manuscript	Figures not critically analyzed	Figures are only described narratively without deeper analytical insight or statistical interpretation.
Entire manuscript	Novelty limited	Similar bibliometric studies on AI in dentistry already exist; manuscript does not sufficiently establish unique contribution specific to radiomics.

Overall Recommendation**Decision:** Major Revision**Main Reasons:**

Major duplication in Introduction section.

Weak methodological transparency.

Limited bibliometric depth.

Poor reference formatting and editorial quality.

Insufficient originality and critical interpretation.

Repetitive and potentially AI-assisted writing style.

Lack of advanced bibliometric indicators and validation methods.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT