

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Research and Reports in Dentistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJRRD_130446
Title of the Manuscript:	SCLEROSING POLYCYSTIC ADENOSIS OF MINOR SALIVARY GLANDS: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW
Type of the Article	Systematic Review

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript holds significant value for the scientific community as it addresses a critical gap in current research, offering new insights that may drive future investigations and innovations. The findings presented have the potential to influence current practices and improve methodologies within the field. By contributing novel data and analyses, the manuscript fosters deeper understanding and opens doors for further exploration on the topic. Additionally, it may inspire researchers to explore unexplored aspects, creating a foundation for future studies that could lead to advancements in both theory and application.	Thank you for the response
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	Ok
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Introduction in the abstract can be improved and slightly elaborated if not exceeding the word limit	Done
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	As per Systemic review it can be further elaborated	Done
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Referring needs to be in UNIFORM manner	Done
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	Differential Diagnosis can be added to make the article more authentic	Done

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	No, as this is the systematic review we are reviewing only the cases reported in the literature.