



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Research and Reports in Dentistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJRRD_53790
Title of the Manuscript:	Platelet rich plasma a new prospective in treatment of recalcitrant erosive lichen planus.
Type of the Article	Case report

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

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The author reported a clinical case of erosive oral lichen planus not responding to steroid therapy treated using platelet rich plasma. Similar cases are already reported in Literature even though this is not a common procedure in the approach to this disease yet.</p> <p>Despite the interesting topic, the manuscript needs important revision. First thing first, all the sections are very poor, the use of this new technique should be better explained, underlying the possible pros and cons of its usage. Which are the other employs of PRP in dentistry and medicine? No mention of the established effects of PRP in ulcerative lesions of the oral mucosa. Also, the etiopathogenesis of OLP, its aspects and the evolutive risks linked to this disease are slightly mentioned, in a very superficial way. Discussion and Introduction sections are almost identical in content and both inadequate. I would have appreciated an excursus about the current available treatments, comparing them with PRP, and an highlight on how the different therapies are influenced by the clinical appearance and behaviour of the disease.</p> <p>About the case report: more general details about the patient and her lesions should be provided. Also, how was the incisional biopsy performed? The improvement of the lesions should be proved not only by the pictures, but using a more objective parameter, like size, pigmentation, inflammation.</p> <p>VAS is mentioned in the table but not in the text.</p> <p>Also, references are quite old and language inadequate.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -According to WHO 2017, the definition "pre-malignant lesions" is incorrect. "Oral potentially malignant diseases" is the updated correct definition. -The eventual involvement of genital mucosae should be mentioned. -Anamnestic data missing -Was DIF performed? 	
Optional/General comments	<p>The topic of this case report is actually interesting, but the manuscript cannot be published in the actual form, major revisions are needed; all the cited issues must be better developed, the case report lacks some information and the form needs deep revision. References must be updated.</p>	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Fedora Della Vella
Department, University & Country	Italy