

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Research and Reports in Dentistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJRRD_85864
Title of the Manuscript:	CLINICOPATHOLOGICAL SPECTRUM OF GLANDULAR ODONTOGENIC CYST - REPORT OF THREE 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 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>the main contribution of the paper is Clinicopathological Spectrum Of Glandular Odontogenic Cyst - Report Of Three Cases.</p> <p>Probably you have done a lot of good work in this study, and an interesting topic. However, the way it is written is not of sufficient clarity, as I read the manuscript, I came upon a few things which were not clear or obvious to reader, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the abstract is vague, does not focus on key results, no specific data presented and there are no conclusions to what the study was about. - Introduction: this needs a complete re-write. What this need is to present what we know of the topic (critical synthesis), and what are the gaps in the literature that covers all your research variables. - Aim of study: you must use a measurable verb to your study as (appraise, define, diagnose, explore, identify, investigate, observe) - Setting: provide details about research setting. - Tools of study: Rephrase the tool - Result: there some unscientific presentation of some variables - Discussion section needs to be sharper and more related to your findings only. I would like to see some discussion of the findings of the papers in relation to recent findings researches on this topic. Some of the fundamental/recent papers in the field are not cited, among your discussion. - Conclusions repeat the findings. 	
Minor REVISION comments	Please there is some spelling mistakes, grammar, and phrasing issues in the introduction and discussion for editing.	
Optional/General comments	<p>"I recommend that this paper not be accepted without major revision."</p> <p>- I`m willing to look at a revised version of the manuscript</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Engy AbdelRhman Khames
Department, University & Country	Modern university for Technology and Information, Egypt