

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Research and Reports in Dentistry</b>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJRRD_80873
Title of the Manuscript:	<b><u>Granular Cell Ameloblastoma Of Mandible with Ghost Cells -A Rare Case Report</u></b>
Type of the Article	<b>Case study</b>

### **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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

		<p><b>Author's comment</b> (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>
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p>	<p>You should be able to formulate your main message in one sentence. For the description of a single case, ask yourself: should I write a full-blown case report, or would a commentary or letter to the editor in an appropriate journal be a more efficient way of sharing this knowledge?</p> <p><b>References; Your references are where you have obtained background information; the list indicates your awareness of prior work in the area of your research. only three references are cited and one of them is to a paper published 28 years ago.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p>	<p>There are some minor grammatical and typographic errors, all of which could be corrected during editing.</p> <p>In conclusion, therefore, I would argue that non-native speakers of English who communicate their science in English should not feel any sense of inferiority vis-a-vis the native speaker in this respect. The overriding framework in determining how to communicate should be the science itself, rather than the rhetorical style of the language.</p> <p>v It is important to remember that the database links the study protocol to the study report. The observations and measurements required by the protocol are documented in the case report form (CRF), from where they are entered into the database for analysis. Google Scholar, first made available in 2004, is an especially useful site when searching for a clinical citation. It seems to let me focus my query better than PubMed and will sometimes even let me have access to a full paper, rather than just an abstract. When data were collected showing that Google provided more than half of all referrals to scientific articles (described above).</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Do I still have contact with the patient? Seek written informed consent or witnessed oral informed consent from your patient/his legal representative. Your patient is definitively lost to follow up? Either do not go further or anonymize all patient-related information (as specified under "Ethical Considerations") in agreement with your manager.</p> <p>There are many terms and expressions prone to erroneous use, even by native speakers of English. There are many more "tricky" words and phrases in English, and native speakers may struggle with them as much as do nonnative speakers. The comma is the most common punctuation mark in scientific texts. It marks a slight break between different parts of a sentence and makes the meaning of sentences clear by grouping and separating words, phrases, and clauses. Correct use of commas is often essential for proper understanding of the meaning of a sentence, and incorrect punctuation can distort your message or make your sentence meaningless.</p> <p>Introduction; This section should set the scene in terms of the existing knowledge based on the literature and the experience of the authors. It should briefly review the current knowledge on the topic, any open issues, and the rationale for the work that is the subject of the publication.</p> <p>Discussion and Conclusions; our primary goal should be to clearly and convincingly communicate the key messages to the reader. Data should be put into context in terms of what is known from the literature. You should show how the data reported in a paper agree and/or disagree with the literature and discuss the possible explanations of these findings.</p> <p>The references should be carefully checked for consistency and correctness. The reader should be able to find the references quoted!</p>	

**Review Form 1.6**

	(Figure 1) is inadequately titled because it does not specify whether the pie chart refers to all patients whose records were assessed or only to those with oral manifestations.	
--	---	--

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>Probably not as long as none of the patients can be identified.</p> <p>No explanation is given.</p> <p>The discussion of patients' oral disease is covered far better than most other aspects of the paper.</p>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Abu-Hussein Muhamad</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Athens, Greece</b>