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Reviewer’s report:

Reviewer’s comments: Page 1

Section on Abstract

Line 8: Duration of study must be mentioned:
â¦from June 1989 to July 1999.

Line 9: Over 67.1% (1251 pts) of allâ¦

Lines 9 to 11: Number and percentage of malignant and benign tumoral growths are mandatory; Example: Kaposi’s sarcoma (409 pts; 21.95%) and so onâ¦

Regards the section on Abstract this is a reasonable review of current data but nil of numerical analysis. If journal’s style permits, authors should add these as gender, age and site distribution.

Keywords:
Oral-Maxillofacial neoplasms, Epidemiology, Retrospective study.

Section of Introduction:

Needs only some literary corrections i.e.:
The term "Great" instead of big and huge. Deleting researcher’s name and mid-name: Example, Wakiaga JM et al.

Section on Materials and Methods:

Page 4, Line 18: the sentence is not meaningful. My suggestion is: However, those cases appearing adjacent to the major salivary glands should be taken with caution.

Again, on the same page, sentences 21 and 22; my suggestion is presented below:

Where the site is listed as oral cavity the neoplasm involved the tongue (oral and oropharyngeal parts), floor of the mouth, gingiva and also the buccal mucosa.

Some literary corrections are needed; Example: suitable substitution for stretching.
Demographic data (people coverage) of two different regions (Mulago Hospital, Uganda; Muhimbili Hospital, Tanzania)

Section on Results:

It needs only literary corrections. Particularly those with Tables 1 to 4.

Section on Discussion: Page 2

Page 12, Line 6:
could be one of the other adenomas such as canalicular, cellular, basal cell, acidophilic and monomorphic adenoma that where not sub-typed.

Page 12, Line 14 and 15:
adenocarcinoma and salivary gland adenocarcinoma as independent entities

The term adenocarcinoma is now used for adenocarcinoma not otherwise specified (NOS). If Lima et al., were classified their tumors conventionally then salivary gland adenocarcinoma (acinic cell carcinoma) would be true adenocarcinoma which would correspond to virtually all other series published. The differences between Jones and Franklin (2006) series and Lima et al.'s (2005) study are purely due to the later researchers used unconventional classification method. Here, this reviewer should say that I could agree more with Jones and Franklin's classification method.

Regards the section on Discussion: the paper needs extensive literary corrections.

Section on References:

Although, the references reflect relevant literature, but, are not well-written and well-organized ;and even with amendments suggested rewriting of this section will presents its own difficulties with standard methods( Example: Refs 21,22,30,31,34 and 40).

Table1:
- Type of lesion, instead of Diagnosis
- Odontogenic myxoma, instead of myxoma
- Chondro myxoid fibrosarcoma, instead of Chondro/Chondro
- Round cell carcinoma; Please replace this term with Small cell carcinoma The reasons for its categorization with sarcomas Was a metastatic tumor in nature? (lung cancer)
- Histiocytic lymphoma; this lesion is a subtype of NHL, the reasons for its independent classification
Centroblastic polymorphic lymphoma (CPL); Again this tumor is a subtype of Burkitt's lymphoma, the reasons of its independent classification.

Anaplastic carcinoma; Do you mean anaplastic carcinoma of thyroid gland?

Basal cell carcinoma; the reasons for its classification with mucous membrane carcinomas

Melanotic ameloblastoma instead of Melanotic progonoma

Please clarify this unusual nomination "chodro shyrigoma" : Do you mean chondro syringoma?

M.H.A.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? Yes
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? Yes
3. Are the data sound? Yes
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? No
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? Yes
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? Yes
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? Yes
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? No
9. Is the writing acceptable? No

Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

REPORT TEMPLATE

Reviewer's report
Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions.

Level of interest
An article of importance in its field

Statistical review
Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.

Declaration of competing interests
I declare that I have no competing interests.
What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.

Declaration of competing interests:

I declare that I have no competing interests.