

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-58283

Title: *High-Grade Myofibroblastic Sarcoma of the Buccal Mucosa: A Rare Oral Malignancy with Rapid Fatal Progression*

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 reports a very rare and clinically significant oral malignancy
- Clinical, histopathological, and immunohistochemical findings are well documented
- High quality photomicrographs and radiographic images support the diagnosis
- Differential diagnosis is discussed appropriately
- The discussion is supported by relevant published literature
- The case highlights the aggressive nature of the disease
- The report has educational value for clinicians and pathologists

Weakness of the study:

- Ethical approval and patient consent are not clearly mentioned
- Follow up details after referral are limited
- The discussion could include more recent case comparisons
- Some grammatical and typographical errors require correction
- Molecular diagnostic findings are not available
- Clinical management details could be described more comprehensively
- Formatting of references should be reviewed for consistency

Reviewers Comments:

This manuscript describes a rare case of high-grade myofibroblastic sarcoma involving the buccal mucosa and highlights its aggressive clinical course. The case is well documented with detailed clinical findings, histopathological examination, and immunohistochemical analysis, making it valuable for both oral pathologists and clinicians. The photomicrographs and imaging findings enhance the scientific quality of the report, and the discussion adequately correlates the findings with previously published literature. However, the manuscript should clearly mention approval from the institutional ethics committee and written informed patient consent for publication of the case and clinical images. Minor grammatical, typographical, and formatting corrections are also recommended to improve readability. The discussion could be strengthened by comparing this case with more recent reports and elaborating on the rationale for management decisions. The limitation of reporting a single case should also be acknowledged. Overall, the manuscript is informative, clinically relevant, and suitable for publication after minor revision.

Previously Published anywhere/Plagiarism check:

The manuscript appears to be an original case report, and no obvious evidence of previous publication or duplicate submission was identified during this review. No apparent plagiarism concerns were observed. However, the journal should perform a routine plagiarism similarity check before publication to confirm originality and ensure compliance with publication ethics.