

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Research and Reports in Dentistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJRRD_99213
Title of the Manuscript:	Prognostic value and clinical significance of LAMP3 (CD208) expression in oral squamous cell carcinoma: An immunohistochemical study
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>)

Review Form 1.7

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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes, this subject is relevant, current and global;</p> <p>2. Yes, but you must not repeat words in the keywords and title;</p> <p>3. Yes, however Very long introduction concerning the results and conclusions, which are what attract the reader and matter in a paper;</p> <p>4. Yes;</p> <p>5. In parts. requires adjustments;</p> <p>6. Yes.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Objective, conclusion, and title triad - Ok</p> <p>Title x keywords – The words (LAMP3, Oral Squamous Cell Carcinoma) were repeated in the keywords and title. Repeating words is not indicated, as this reduces the chance of the article being found, read, and cited. In addition, this undermines the journal's impact factor.</p> <p>Abstract – Very long introduction concerning the results and conclusions, which are what attract the reader and matter in a paper.</p> <p>Introduction: It is indicated that the objective of the study is presented in the last paragraph of the introduction.</p> <p>Methods – “All clinical characteristics, such as gender, age, habits (tobacco and alcohol consumption), differentiation, and tumor location, were obtained from the medical records of patients in the Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Pathology, Dental College & Hospital.” The association between these data by tests such as Spearman or Pearson and their correlation coefficient results and P value presented to the reader could be investigated. After the correlation test, for the variables with the highest correlations, an inferential test such as a binary or multiple linear regression would be indicated to, based on the R2 values, predict the possibility that a behavior x would predict an outcome y in these patients. For the ANOVA analyses, what post hoc test was used?</p> <p>Results: Will be improved with the test results suggested in the “methods” field.</p> <p>Discussion – I thought it was poor for such relevant data, but the discussion will undoubtedly be improved with the application of correlation and regression tests.</p> <p>Conclusion: It should also be improved based on the proposed tests.</p> <p>References - ok</p>	

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:	Luis Carlos Oliveira Gonçalves
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Mato Grosso, Brazil