Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Research and Reports in Dentistry**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJRRD_84431**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Fibrous focal hyperplasia: A case report**
Type of the Article	**Case study**

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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**Dear author(s),** **Thank you for submitting your valuable research work to IJRRD.** **It's a well written manuscript. However, it requires some modification.**	
Minor REVISION comments	• In the first few lines of introduction (line nos-26-28) the author(s) first stated that- Oral cavity may act as one of the common sites for development of gingival overgrowths. And the second line states that "these localized enlargements like pyogenic granuloma, irritation fibroma, peripheral ossifying fibroma , peripheral calcifying fibroma have rare occurrence and mostly they occur in response to chronic irritation or stimuli. Kindly address/clarify the controversial statements. Also check line no 93 (in Discussion para) • Kindly address the specific lesion with a single name instead of using multiple names for the lesion (for better readability and clarity of the text) • Kindly quote the figure nos. at the appropriate places within the text • Spelling mistake in line no. 22 • Reference styling needs to be corrected 64, 66 • Grammatical correction required in line no. 18 • There is no need of a reference in the conclusion (as conclusion is often the summary of an independent research work and hence does not require any scientific proof/comparison with the work of other researchers) Conclusion needs to be shortened and revised (appearing a bit elongated, more descriptive then it should be; points mentioned in the conclusion belong moreto the case presentation/discussion part)	
Optional/General comments	High-lighted parts need revision	

Review Form 1.6

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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Aushili Mahule**
Department, University & Country	**Maharashtra University of Health and Sciences (MUHS), India**