

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Research and Reports in Dentistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJRRD_95324
Title of the Manuscript:	Verruciform Xanthoma : A Case Report
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> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	Dear all, Honestly, I have reviewed the manuscript and I have noticed a some of notes. I change its color to red if the author/s wants to manage it, which is important before publishing. 1. Yes, I think it's an important subject for the community even if it is recurrent. 2. Maybe, and can use: the lower lip Verruciform Xanthoma or oral Verruciform Xanthoma 3. Maybe but without the aim and no mention of our case. 4. Maybe, with some notes on the subsections of the manuscript 5. Yes 6. No, most of them are not updated, and best to mention the year of publication when mentioned in the writing, I changed it to red color	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Not totally, and some paragraphs need rearrangement especially in the discussion.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	- The introduction is short and not enough - No aim of the study in the introduction or abstract. - It is best to mention the time, period, and place of work of the case study. - There are some incorrect spaces between words, I change them to color. -The abbreviation mentioned after writing the full name of it the first time, PAS? IHC? - The figures could be better arranged to be clearer and more useful	

### 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Mahmood J. Jawad</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Al Zahrawi University College, Iraq</b>