

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Research and Reports in Dentistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJRRD_98676
Title of the Manuscript:	ORAL DESQUAMATIONS OF CLINICAL INTEREST – a report of 2 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)
<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. It seems to me a subject of interest due to the difficulty of diagnosis and the frequency with which these lesions occur in clinical practice.</p> <p>2. The title is appropriate and in my opinion it encompasses the type of pathology to be studied and the presentation of cases.</p> <p>3. It is a brief, objective and precise summary of the most relevant content of the academic document it accompanies.</p> <p>4. The work seems very well structured to me but it would be more complete if in the last part of the introduction paragraph the hypothesis that you want to test is stated more clearly, and clearly describe your objectives.</p> <p>5. I think it's correct.</p> <p>6. The bibliography seems correct to me, although authors with many years of publication support the work in the context of oral mucosa lesions.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Although English is not my primary language, I consider that it is correct, I have been able to understand it easily and the terminology is correct.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Maria Carolina Virga
Department, University & Country	National University of Cordoba, Argentina