

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: JNHM-145

Title: *Literary Review of Dentigerous Cyst: Case Report*

Recommendation:

- Accept as it is
- ✓ Accept after minor revision.....
- Accept after major revision
- Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity		✓		
Significance	✓			

Reviewer Name: Dr S. K. Nath

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Strength of the study:

- The manuscript presents a clinically relevant pediatric case of a dentigerous cyst
- Clinical, radiographic, surgical, and histopathological findings are clearly described
- Good quality clinical photographs support the diagnosis and treatment
- The discussion is supported by recent and relevant literature
- The report emphasizes interdisciplinary management
- The conclusions are consistent with the presented findings
- The case has educational value for dental professionals

Weakness of the study:

- Ethical approval and informed consent are not clearly mentioned
- The title should better reflect the case report design
- Long-term postoperative follow-up is not provided
- The discussion could include more comparison with similar published cases
- Minor grammatical and language corrections are required
- The limitations of reporting a single case should be discussed
- Reference formatting requires greater consistency

Reviewers Comments:

The manuscript presents an interesting case of a dentigerous cyst in a pediatric patient and highlights the importance of early diagnosis and multidisciplinary management. The clinical presentation, radiographic findings, surgical procedure, and histopathological examination are described clearly and are supported by appropriate clinical images. The discussion is relevant and relates the findings to existing literature. However, the manuscript should clearly mention approval from the institutional ethics committee or state whether ethical approval was exempt for this case report. Written informed consent from the patient's guardian for publication of clinical information and images should also be included. Minor grammatical and formatting corrections are recommended to improve readability and presentation. The discussion would benefit from a broader comparison with previously published pediatric cases and a brief mention of long-term follow-up. As a single case report, the limitations should be acknowledged more clearly. Overall, the manuscript is informative and suitable for publication after minor revision.

Previously Published anywhere/Plagiarism check:

The manuscript appears to describe an original clinical case and no obvious evidence of duplicate publication or copied content was identified during this review. However, a routine plagiarism similarity check should be performed by the journal before publication to confirm originality and ensure adherence to publication ethics.