



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: “Spectrophotometric Evaluation of Natural Tooth Color Distribution Across Three Dental Shade Guide Systems”

Submitted: 01 May 2026

Accepted: 08 June 2026

Published: 30 June 2026

Corresponding Author: Julija Zarkova Atanasova

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n18p1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Jose Grillo Evangelista
Egas Moniz Higher Institute of Health Science, Portugal

Reviewer 2: Salome Omiadze
European University, Georgia

Reviewer 3: Abbas Taher
University of Kufa, Kufa-Najaf, Iraq

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is good, but somewhat long. You could make it more direct, for example:
“Spectrophotometric Analysis of Natural Tooth Color Distribution Across Three Dental Shade Guide Systems.”

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.

I would say it is at a good level, but with minor stylistic improvements and greater informational density in the results section, it could become significantly stronger.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

There are no serious grammar problems.
The English is correct and academic, but it's not yet fully scientific in style; it needs improvement to a more native level.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study methods are generally well-structured, clear, and technically adequate for a cross-sectional clinical study in aesthetic dentistry.

The results are clear and do not contain errors.

The results are correct, but somewhat descriptive. They lack quantitative impact. For example, if they included important percentages, the summary would improve considerably: prevalence of groups, differences between sexes, and age-related trends. Also, transforming some of the tables into supplementary material would greatly improve their results.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusion is well-written, coherent, and aligned with the results, fulfilling the basic role of any scientific conclusion.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

There are incomplete references, for example:
“Journal of Prosthodontics.” (no volume, pages, full year formatted correctly)

“Materiais Odontológicos.” (no volume/pages)

“Jornal de Odontologia.” (no details).

The authors must standardize everything: Journal names are correct abbreviation (Index Medicus style), Volume (issue): pages or article number. Consistency: “et al.” is always applied the same way

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the RESULTS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Strong, clinically relevant study; adequate, well-executed methodology; and robust, consistent results.

They should pay more attention to the list of references.

The article needs linguistic revision.

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

the title is clear, informative and adequately reflects the content and objectives of the study

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.

the abstract is well structured and clearly summarizes the objectives, methodology, main findings and conclusions of the study

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

the manuscript is generally well written.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

the methodology is clearly described and allows good understanding of the study design and spectrophotometric procedures.

The results are clear and do not contain errors.

the results are clearly and supported by appropriate statistical analysis. the tables are informative and help facilitate interpretation of the findings.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

the conclusion are consistent with the presented results and appropriately reflect the objectives and findings of the study

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

the references are relevant, current and appropriate for the topic of the study. the manuscript is supported by suitable scientific literature

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the RESULTS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, no revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Reviewer C:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

YES

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.

YES

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

YES

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

YES

The results are clear and do not contain errors.

YES

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

YES

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

YES

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the RESULTS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

GOOD ARTICLE
