

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Cancer and Tumor International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JCTI_102868
Title of the Manuscript:	Oral Squamous Cell Carcinoma of the Mandible with Management of Wide Excisi, Right Hemimandibulectomy, Mandibular Reconstruction, and Pectoralis Major Myocutaneous Flap: A Rare Case Report
Type of the Article	Case report

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljcti.com/index.php/JCTI/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The authors present the case of a not-that rare major operation for an oral carcinoma. An interesting issue is the young age of the patient (35 years old). An important message is the differential diagnosis by inflammatory conditions that may lead to misdiagnosis.</p> <p>2. The title is relevant but it could be more inclusive and not that extended.</p> <p>3. the abstract is comprehensive</p> <p>4. The structure of the manuscript is appropriate. Probably, a separate section of clinical differential diagnosis could be beneficial since other types of neoplasias more relevant to the age of the patient (odontogenic, sarcomas, melanomas, hematologic) could account for this clinical presentation.</p> <p>5. The manuscript, generally, is scientifically correct however many information is missing to be scientifically useful (see general comments).</p> <p>6. There are 12 references; only 3 are of the last 5 years.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. I suggest a professional language editing</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. information regarding staging is necessary</p> <p>2. information regarding transoperative and postoperative complications and incidents</p> <p>3. information regarding follow up since 2021</p> <p>4. Comments on the adjuvant radio and chemotherapy for this case</p> <p>5. Comment in the discussion section regarding the rarity and the possible reasons for the occurrence of a squamous carcinoma in the the age of 35 years old.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anastasios Goulioumis
Department, University & Country	Karamandanio Hospital of Patras, Greece