



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMMR_48290</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>ODONTOGENIC KERATOCYST MIMICKING A DENTIGEROUS CYST: A CASE REPORT</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Case report</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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<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>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>The presented case report has added nothing new to what is already known, but the authors have more or less just presented a classical case of odontogenic keratocyst. In the same vein, the topic does not appear too appropriate, considering the fact that there was nowhere along the path of diagnosis (from clinical to histologic diagnosis) where the authors seemingly encountered a diagnostic dilemma between OKC and dentigerous cyst. And this is what the topic seemingly portends; to let other researchers or clinicians be aware of a possible diagnostic challenge.</p> <p>Parts of the discussion look like direct copying of statements from "Deepak Passi, Deepika Singhal, Mahinder Singhet <i>al.</i> 2017. "Odontogenic Keratocyst (OKC) or Keratocystic Odontogenic Tumor (KCOT). Journey of OKC from cyst to tumor to cyst again : Comprehensive review with recent updates on WHO classification (2017) <i>International Journal of Current Research</i>, 9, (07), 54080-54086" with some of them not properly referenced.</p> <p>Several inconsistencies with referencing styles; sometimes all the pages are written in full, while in some they are not e.g. ref. no. 2,3,4,5,6. Also some references have the names of journals written in italics some do not e.g. ref. no. 6,7,8,9.</p> <p>The authors should endeavor to use arrows or a form of pointer to show specific areas of interest in the histology slide pictures</p> <p>Other comments, corrections, suggestions as highlighted in the attached revised manuscript</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

**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>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> No consent obtained from the patient. Although the eyes were cropped, if this is in line with the journals requirement, then it is okay.	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Olalere Omoyosola Gbolahan</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>University of Ibadan, Nigeria</i></b>