

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Research and Reports in Dentistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJRRD_129113
Title of the Manuscript:	Clinico- Pathological Features of Spindle Cell Carcinoma of the Oral Cavity : A Systematic Review
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	It is a good topic to write a review article as such a compilation is rare as Spindle cell carcinoma of the oral cavity is a rare but aggressive malignancy requiring a multidisciplinary approach for diagnosis and management. Comprehensive understanding of its clinicopathological features and appropriate use of immunohistochemical markers are vital for accurate diagnosis and improving patient outcomes.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, suitable	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	In objective: The word "synthesize" will not be appropriate as data is not created rather it is collected. Methodology can be comprehended better and short description of both inclusion and exclusion criteria to be mentioned. What is the meaning of 91 participants?? Conclusion can be more concise	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Introduction: Squamous cell carcinomas account for up to 80–85% of oral malignancies (specify the malignancy as only SCC variants are written), which include several variants like verrucous, basaloid, adenoid, spindle cell, adenosquamous, and undifferentiated carcinomata.3 – No word like this In this tumor keratinocytes infiltrate the dermis (Can be written as connective tissue) as single cells. There is a mismatch between results related to site predilection in abstract (tongue) and introduction (lower lip). The clinical common to all cases... correct this sentence	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Referencing format is not correct	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Grammar can be improved, Exclusion spelling is wrong	
Optional/General comments	Good information is collaborated	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hajira Khatoon
Department, University & Country	Ramaiah University of Applied Sciences, India