



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_25247
Title of the Manuscript:	Mucous Retention Cyst – Review of literature and a case report.
Type of Article	Case Report

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
1) The manuscript does not offer any new insight to the current literature and it discusses about mucocele which is one of the commonest lesion of oral cavity. 2) The authors have not carried out the suggested changes. 3) The manuscript is highly plagiarised from different articles. 4) The histopathological pictures are poor and non conclusive. 5) The authors were suggested to make the changes in order to make the manuscript interesting for the readers authors have not done any such effort. 6) The manuscript lacks novelty. 7) The manuscript states some erroneous statements which were highlighted in the initial evaluation not such efforts were carried by authors. 8) The manuscript is not of scientific interest at the same time it does not add any new information. 8) The manuscript neither conveys a unique treatment modality nor it does report a rare case. 9) The manuscript contains numerous spelling errors. 10) References are not written according to the journal's instruction. 11) So much of material has directly stolen from different articles. 12) The aetiology of the present lesion was not discussed by authors even after reviewer's suggestion. 13) Why the differential diagnosis of lipoma was made? The lesion does not look like lipoma not even the site of the lesion ensures the diagnostic possibility of lipoma. 14) The manuscript is misleading and number of statements is confusing. 15) I cannot understand that why authors stressed to discuss the differentiation of mucous retention cyst and extravasation phenomenon? Even an undergraduate student knows the difference. 16) The presentation of the case is very poor; authors should learn to write a scientific report. 17) Intra - operative pictures are missing that makes the manuscript suspicious of fake reporting. 18) The connective tissue capsule does not show a moderate inflammatory reaction. 19) Why the lymph nodes examination included? When the provisional and differential diagnosis was not a malignant salivary gland tumor 20) How much of tissue was removed? No details are provided 21) No post operative picture was provided 22) On the last note a picture of mucinophages were suggested to incorporate in the article and authors could not even provide the picture.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	NIMS Dental college, Jaipur, India