

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Dental Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJDS_112478
Title of the Manuscript:	Long standing ameloblastoma mimicking residual cyst – a unique case report.
Type of the Article	Case study

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. This article discusses a unique case of unicystic ameloblastoma, a rare variant of ameloblastoma that resembles a residual cyst. It highlights the challenge in differentiating this type of ameloblastoma from a dentigerous cyst, emphasizing the importance of clinical, radiological, and histopathological evaluations in diagnosis. The case involves a patient with long-standing unicystic ameloblastoma that emerged after dental extraction and was initially misdiagnosed as a residual cyst. The abstract also mentions the treatment undertaken, including enucleation followed by excisional biopsy, revealing a type three variant according to Ackerman's classification.</p> <p>3. To improve the abstract, consider the following aspects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity and Precision: Ensure that the abstract clearly summarizes the key points of the study, including its focus, main findings, and the case's relevance. • Brevity: Keep the abstract concise and to the point, covering only the most critical aspects of the study. • Contextualization: Briefly mention why this case is unique or important in the broader context of research on unicystic ameloblastoma. • Clinical Implications: If relevant, briefly highlight the clinical implications or recommendations derived from the study. <p>4. Clinical Case Description</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The clinical case presentation describes the History of Present Illness. However, it is crucial to attach pertinent information such as: History of Past Illness, Personal and Family History, Laboratory Examinations. • It is essential to delve into and detail the surgical stage of the clinical case. <p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The discussion should address the various potential etiological factors associated with ameloblastoma. While providing a comprehensive overview is important, the discussion could condense and focus more on synthesizing this information to highlight the most significant factors. • The discussion do not touches on previous studies of the management of ameloblastoma. A more in-depth analysis and criticism of these studies would enhance the discussion's depth and allow for a more nuanced understanding of the current state of research on this topic. • The discussion mentions the surgical excision as the treatment of choice for ameloblastoma, but it would be beneficial to provide a more detailed analysis of treatment options, their pros and cons, and the rationale for choosing surgical excision. Additionally, the discussion on recurrence rates could be more comprehensive and could explore potential factors contributing to recurrence in greater detail. <p>5. From a scientific standpoint, the article appears to provide valuable insights into the diagnosis and management of a rare variant of ameloblastoma. However, a few points that might enhance the scientific rigor of the paper.</p> <p>6. Reference</p> <p>It is necessary to update the bibliography. It is suggested to cite articles no more than 10 years old. This bibliography is suggested:</p> <p>1. Ghai S. (2022). Ameloblastoma: An Updated Narrative Review of an Enigmatic</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>Tumor. Cureus, 14(8), e27734. https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.27734</p> <p>2. Rajasekaran, A. M., Prasad, C., Balaji, J., Arunkumar, K., & Raghavan, P. (2023). Unicystic ameloblastoma - A case series. Indian journal of dental research : official publication of Indian Society for Dental Research, 34(1), 104–107. https://doi.org/10.4103/ijdr.ijdr_521_22</p> <p>3. Rayamajhi, S., Shrestha, S., Shakya, S., Bhandari, S., Twayana, A. R., & Shahi, K. (2022). Unicystic Ameloblastoma of Mandible: A Case Report. JNMA; journal of the Nepal Medical Association, 60(251), 657–660. https://doi.org/10.31729/jnma.7566</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sarah Monserrat Lomelí Martínez
Department, University & Country	Universidad de Guadalajara, México