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Reviewer’s report:

I am glad to review the above article, which I found quite interesting and informative. The authors have done a lot of background research and have performed a commendable job on the same.

The article addresses an issue of importance to the medical fraternity, discussing the question of pathogenesis of fibrous dysplasia, especially craniofacial fibrous dysplasia. The manuscript appears well reasoned, is relatively balanced and with an acceptable standard of writing.

I would however, like the authors to address certain comments, which I think would help in refining the article to a higher degree of excellence:

- Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Page 6: I and II paragraph: Revision of language used, and clarity of picture requested, to better understand the differences between FD of long bones and CFD. The second paragraph especially, makes it unclear whether the authors mean FD of long bones or CFD.

2. Page 7: The three radiological patterns in CFD can be explained, especially the distinctive “ground glass appearance”.

- Minor Essential Revisions :

1. Page 2: Abstract: The second sentence appears to be too long; hence the message the authors want to convey is lost in the process. I suggest a splitting of the sentence to improve on the meaningfulness of the same.

2. Page 3: The second sentence can be modified as “JLS is characterized by polyostotic FD and café au lait pigmented skin lesions, while MAS has additional features of hyperfunctional endocrinopathies manifesting as precocious puberty, hyperthyroidism or acromegaly.

3. Page 4: The second paragraph would be more meaningful if it is altered as “The systemic manifestations of the Gs# protein –coupled receptor complex include….

4. Fourth paragraph : Spelling mistake : “Pregastrulation”

6. Page 7: Punctuation marks have not been used in the proper places, thereby changing the meaning of the second sentence in “treatment”.

7. The fourth sentence should read either “However the rate of recurrence after surgical excision is high” or “However recurrence after surgical excision is common”.

8. The legend of figure 5 should be altered: It is absence of “osteoblastic” rimming and not osteoclastic.

9. Necessary punctuation marks are not in place in some sections of the text; the relevance of the sentences is hence lost.

- Discretionary Revisions

1. The bibliography should be checked again. References from textbooks should include the place of publication also. “pp” or “P” before the page numbers can be removed. Pubmed check for references required.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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