

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Research and Reports in Dentistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJRRD_96981
Title of the Manuscript:	Post COVID-19 Mucormycosis In Mandible- Case Report Of Two Rare Cases
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.journalijrrd.com/index.php/IJRRD/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<p>The manuscript is scientifically very important as very few cases have been documented in the literature of muromycosis of mandible but it is very poorly written. The author has mentioned two cases somewhere the age mentioned is wrong other places reference of only one case. There is lack of clarity.</p> <p>yes</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive but in case report method should not be mentioned.</p> <p>Yes but heading at places are wrong. Definitely</p> <p>In case report the references are sufficient but if review is mentioned then more references are required.</p> <p>Discussion is lacking clarity. Conclusion is also very poorly written</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
Optional/General comments	The author requires to rewrite the manuscript as these cases are very important scientifically. They need to be documented also each case should be properly discussed.	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pawandeep Kaur Sandhu Virk
Department, University & Country	Consultant Virk Dental Clinic, India