

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>)

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.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes, as more cases needed in oral dermatology, this manuscript consists of 2 and important for scientific community.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title is suitable.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. Yes, subsections and structure are appropriate.</p> <p>5. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. Yes, the references are sufficient.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Although, generally, the manuscript is scientifically important and comprehensive, throughout the manuscript, one can find many typos and spelling errors. Also, there are many punctuation errors. Below, I have given some examples, which are italic.</p> <p><i>on palpation it is tender with no evidence of bleeding [figure 2]</i> <i>Her Direct immunofluorescence study revealed ...</i> <i>Pt gives history of a single ulcer ...</i> Based on history and clinical presentation a provisional diagnosis of <i>Drug eruptions ...</i> The patient was treated with prednisolone 10 mg twice daily for 14 days and tapered to once daily <i>for10</i> days ... Biopsy for suspected <i>Vesiculobullous</i> disease shows subepithelial separation in pemphigoid and <i>Intraepithelial</i> separation ... Among the vesiculobullous diseases, <i>pemphigus vulgaris (PV)</i> and <i>benign mucous membrane pemphigoid (BMMP)</i> are prominent (the first letter must be capital)</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mustafa Kandaz
Department, University & Country	Karadeniz Technical University, Turkey