

Dear Pravallika Kakada, Dr:

Your submission Multi-Omics Convergence in Odontogenic Tumor Research: A Scientometric and Translational Mapping Study 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 B:

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?

Yes

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 Long

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

Good

Originality

Excellent

Overall

Good

Recommendation

Minor Revision

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

Yes

Comments

Comments to the Author

This work presents an important exploration of trends in odontogenic tumor research and how this field is evolving considering overall current trends. It is an important look into this aspect and presents quantitative methods to evaluate this evolution. The authors achieved important results and observations in this work. I have some minor comments regarding this paper:

1 - Many trends are explored in this work, but I have observed that an aspect that was brought up in more than one graph but that wasn't directly explored in the text is the evolution of keywords and trending topics in the field. The paragraph above Figure 2, for example, which presents this data, does not explore this finding directly, focusing on other aspects of the analysis which could also be presented in an additional figure or table in addition to what is being presented in Figure 2.

2 - It would also be interesting to explore the limitations of this work in the discussion in order to inform readers and direct future works. This is a good practice that aids in better understanding the scientific aspects behind the work. It shows both ways for improvement in the future while also setting expectations for the interpretation of the results achieved in this article.

There are also very minor corrections which are present in the review file I have attached. Beyond these observations, I believe there are no impediments for the publication of this work.

Reviewer E:

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?

Yes

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).

none

Rating

Interest*

Good

Quality

Good

Originality

Good

Overall

Good

Recommendation

Accept

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

Yes

Comments

Comments to the Author

Dear authors,

I hope that the contributions made to your text will further enhance this very interesting work.

Please consider the comments made, especially regarding biomarkers. I believe that including a more robust text on biomarkers will further enhance your work.

This important topic was omitted throughout the work.

Reviewer B:

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?

Yes

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 Long

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

Good

Originality

Excellent

Overall

Good

Recommendation

Minor Revision

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

Yes

Comments

Comments to the Author

This work presents an important exploration of trends in odontogenic tumor research and how this field is evolving considering overall current trends. It is an important look into this aspect and presents quantitative methods to evaluate this

evolution. The authors achieved important results and observations in this work. I have some minor comments regarding this paper:

1 - Many trends are explored in this work, but I have observed that an aspect that was brought up in more than one graph but that wasn't directly explored in the text is the evolution of keywords and trending topics in the field. The paragraph above Figure 2, for example, which presents this data, does not explore this finding directly, focusing on other aspects of the analysis which could also be presented in an additional figure or table in addition to what is being presented in Figure 2.

2 - It would also be interesting to explore the limitations of this work in the discussion in order to inform readers and direct future works. This is a good practice that aids in better understanding the scientific aspects behind the work. It shows both ways for improvement in the future while also setting expectations for the interpretation of the results achieved in this article.

There are also very minor corrections which are present in the review file I have attached. Beyond these observations, I believe there are no impediments for the publication of this work.

Reviewer E:

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?

Yes

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).

none

Rating

Interest*

Good

Quality

Good

Originality

Good

Overall

Good

Recommendation

Accept

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

Yes

Comments

Comments to the Author

Dear authors,

I hope that the contributions made to your text will further enhance this very interesting work.

Please consider the comments made, especially regarding biomarkers. I believe that including a more robust text on biomarkers will further enhance your work. This important topic was omitted throughout the work.

Your submission Multi-Omics Convergence in Odontogenic Tumor Research: A Scientometric and Translational Mapping Study to Brazilian Dental Science, has been revised and odontogenic keratocyst (OKC) was reclassified as keratocystic odontogenic tumour (KCOT) from 2005 to 2017. The authors mention in the text as if they were different pathologies. It is also important to clarify each abbreviation or acronym throughout the manuscript: this need to be addressed. Ideally, in every citation of an acronym or abbreviation for the first time, the authors need to include its meaning, as the authors have done some times, but not all. If the authors chose to include OKC as an odontogenic tumor, there should be a paragraph introducing and explaining this decision. The authors should weight in one side the fact that is is indeed a cyst and can sometimes be treated in a

conservative fashion with previous decompression (1. Maurette PE, Jorge J, de Moraes M. Conservative treatment protocol of odontogenic keratocyst: a preliminary study. *J Oral Maxillofac Surg.* 2006;64 (3):379-83. doi:10.1016/j.joms.2005.11.007.; 2. Pogrel MA, Jordan RCK. Marsupialization as a definitive treatment for the odontogenic keratocysts. *J Oral Maxillofac Surg.* 2004;62 (6):651-655. doi:10.1016/j.joms.2003.08.029; 3. Yildirim G, Ataoglu H, Kalayci A, Ozkan BT, Kucuk K, Esen A. Conservative Treatment Protocol for Keratocystic Odontogenic Tumour: a Follow-up Study of 3 Cases. *J Oral Maxillofac Res.* 2010 Oct 1;1(3):e7. doi: 10.5037/jomr.2010.1307); 4. Nath P, Menon S, Sham ME, Kumar V, Archana S. Conservative Management of Odontogenic Keratocyst in a Tertiary Hospital. *Ann Maxillofac Surg.* 2020 Jan-Jun;10(1):122-126. doi: 10.4103/ams.ams_260_18. Epub 2020 Jun 8; 5. Anand R, Kumar Y, Bhagat N. Conservative Approach for the Management of Odontogenic Keratocyst: Our Experience. *Cureus.* 2024 Sep 13;16(9):e69306. doi: 10.7759/cureus.69306). Please answer these considerations point-by-point in a separate document and also, please, make all the new corrections only, 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,