

Subject: [BDS] Editor Decision

Dear DIVYAMBIKA CATAPATRI VENUGOPAL, DHIVYA, ELENGKUMARAN, ARAVIND WARRIER, LEENA DJ, MALATHI:

Your submission AN UNUSUAL PRESENTATION OF OSTEOSARCOMA INVOLVING MANDIBLE: OSTEOSARCOMA OF JAW to Brazilian Dental Science, has been revised and according to reviewers' comments, there are questions to be addressed and/or points to be clarified/corrected.

Please answer the reviewers considerations point-by-point in a separate document and also please make all the corrections in the text highlighted in yellow.

Deadline: 30 days

Thank you for considering Brazilian Dental Science for publishing your research. We are looking forward the revised version of you manuscript.

Sincerely,

-----  
Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Revisions Required  
-----

**Questionnaire**

Does the manuscript contain new and significant information to justify publication?\*

Yes

Does the Abstract (Summary) clearly and accurately describe the content of the article?

No

Is the problem significant and concisely stated?

Yes

Are the methods or research design described comprehensively? Is the statistical analysis adequate?

Not Applicable

Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the results?

Yes

Is adequate reference made to other work in the field?

Yes

Is the language acceptable?

Yes

### **Manuscript Structure**

Length of article is:\*

Adequate

Number of tables is:

Adequate

Number of figures is:

Too Short

**Please state any conflict(s) of interest that you have in relation to the review of this paper (state “none” if this is not applicable).**

None.

**Rating**

Interest\*

Good

Quality

Average

Originality

Good

Overall

Good

**Recommendation**

Minor Revision

**Would you be willing to review a revision of this manuscript?**

Yes

**Comments***Comments to the Author*

I would like to commend the authors for addressing a relevant topic in the field of dentistry. The case presented offers significant contributions to the diagnosis and management of mandibular osteosarcoma. Below are some suggestions to enhance the clarity, completeness, and alignment of your manuscript with the CARE guidelines and the journal's requirements.

**Title:**

According to the CARE guideline, it is recommended that the title include the primary diagnosis or intervention followed by the words "case report." Consider adjusting the title to reflect this recommendation.

**Abstract:**

According to the journal's guidelines, the submitted manuscript must include the title followed by the abstract, which is limited to 250 words.

Next to the abstract, five keywords should be listed in alphabetical order, aligned with the terms from MeSH (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/mesh>).

**Case Report:**

The CARE guidelines recommend including information such as pre-existing conditions, family history, and relevant habits. Please consider adding these details to provide a more comprehensive clinical context.

Although the text mentions that the patient underwent hemimandibulectomy, I suggest providing more details about the postoperative follow-up, including

treatment response and current prognosis.

The report mentions osteomyelitis, but it would be beneficial to list other conditions that could have been considered in the differential diagnosis.

Discussion:

Add at least two references of similar case reports and compare them with the present case. The CARE guidelines recommend including a brief review of published cases to provide context for the report.

Include a paragraph explaining in more detail why PET/CT was crucial in the diagnosis, highlighting how it differs from other diagnostic tools.

These modifications will help improve the manuscript's clarity, adherence to reporting guidelines, and overall scientific contribution. I appreciate the opportunity to review your work and look forward to seeing the revised version.

Once again, I would like to commend the authors for their work. With the suggested adjustments, the article has the potential to make an even more significant impact on the scientific literature.

-----

-----

Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

-----

## **Questionnaire**

Does the manuscript contain new and significant information to justify publication?\*

Yes

Does the Abstract (Summary) clearly and accurately describe the content of the article?

Yes

Is the problem significant and concisely stated?

Yes

Are the methods or research design described comprehensively? Is the statistical analysis adequate?

Not Applicable

Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the results?

Yes

Is adequate reference made to other work in the field?

Yes

Is the language acceptable?

Yes

### **Manuscript Structure**

Length of article is:\*

Adequate

Number of tables is:

Adequate

Number of figures is:

Adequate

**Please state any conflict(s) of interest that you have in relation to the review of this paper (state “none” if this is not applicable).**

Nenhum

**Rating**

Interest\*

Excellent

Quality

Good

Originality

Good

Overall

Good

**Recommendation**

Minor Revision

**Would you be willing to review a revision of this manuscript?**

Yes

## **Comments**

### *Comments to the Author*

Caso interessante, bem registrado, tanto clinicamente quanto em termos de exames de imagem e anatomopatologia.

Sugiro revisão das siglas mencionadas no texto.

#### **INTRODUÇÃO**

- “29- year-old” – revisar a digitação;
- Adicionar ao objetivo a relevância do PET/CT no diagnóstico precoce.
- O significado da sigla PET/CT não foi mencionada antes do objetivo. Escrever por extenso.

#### **RELATO DE CASO**

- Mencionam apenas TCLE, não mencionam aprovação pelo CEP nem número de CAAE e parecer.
- No tratamento, mencionar se houve esvaziamento cervical na cirurgia.

-----