

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-58897

Title: A BIBLIOMETRIC ANALYSIS OF STUDIES ON KNOWLEDGE LEVELS, AWARENESS, ATTITUDES, ANXIETY LEVELS, AND RISK PERCEPTION REGARDING DENTAL RADIATION AMONG PATIENTS, DENTAL STUDENTS, AND DENTAL HEALTH PROFESSIONAL.

Recommendation:

Accept after major revision

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

Reviewer's ID: JPR-237

Detailed Reviewer's Report

The manuscript is publishable after substantial revision. The authors should particularly strengthen the search strategy, study-selection procedure, methodological reproducibility, handling of the incomplete 2026 data, and interpretation of the bibliometric findings.

- 1. The search strategy requires greater detail and clarification. The complete Web of Science search string, including Boolean operators, field codes, truncation, filters, publication period, and date of the search should be provided to ensure reproducibility. The current strategy may also miss studies using terms such as radiation safety, radiation protection, radiation dose, dental X-ray, and radiographic exposure.***
- 2. The analysis is based only on the Web of Science Core Collection and includes 74 publications. The authors should provide a clear justification for excluding databases such as Scopus and PubMed/MEDLINE and discuss the possibility of database-related selection bias.***

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- 3. The manuscript does not adequately describe the screening and selection of records. Clear inclusion/exclusion criteria should be provided, together with the number of records retrieved, screened, excluded, and finally included. A PRISMA-style flow diagram would be helpful.*
- 4. The final dataset of 74 publications is relatively small for a bibliometric analysis involving several populations and multiple research concepts. The authors should discuss how this may affect the stability of the co-occurrence networks and thematic clusters.*
- 5. Since 2026 is an incomplete publication year, the exact search date should be reported. The authors should consider presenting 2026 separately from complete publication years to avoid inappropriate comparisons.*
- 6. The rationale for dividing the literature into 1991–2017 and 2018–2026 is unclear. The authors should explain why 2017 was selected as the cutoff and provide an objective basis for this division.*
- 7. The rationale for selecting 450 abstract terms, the minimum cluster frequency, $\alpha = 0.5$, and the minimum weight index should be explained. The software and Bibliometrix/Biblioshiny versions should also be reported.*
- 8. The authors state that synonymous and similar terms were merged, but the actual normalization procedure is not provided. Because this process can substantially influence the network and thematic structure, a thesaurus or supplementary list of merged terms should be provided.*
- 9. Some interpretations appear stronger than the bibliometric results support. Co-occurrence demonstrates relationships among terms but does not establish causal or definitive conceptual relationships.*

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Similarly, a theme's position on a thematic map should not automatically be interpreted as evidence of clinical importance.

- 10. Themes classified within the emerging or declining” quadrant cannot be identified as genuinely emerging or declining solely from their position on the thematic map. Temporal evidence should be used before making such conclusions.*
- 11. The Discussion frequently repeats the Results. It would be strengthened by focusing more on the significance of the identified trends, comparison with previous research, unexplored areas, and implications for dental education, patient communication, and radiation protection.*
- 12. The claim that no previous bibliometric analysis has been conducted in this field should be supported by a comprehensive search or expressed more cautiously. Similar studies may exist under different terminology or in other databases.*