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Which of the following following best describes what type of case report this is?: Other

If other, please specify:

As the authors stated , the disease is a rare one but they didn't mention why the case is atypical ( as stated in the title ) or what unexpected or unusual presentation exists with this case.

Has the case been reported coherently?: Yes

Is the case report authentic?: Yes

Is the case report ethical?: Yes

Is there any missing information that you think must be added before publication?: Yes

Is this case worth reporting?: Yes

Is the case report persuasive?: Yes

Does the case report have explanatory value?: No

Does the case report have diagnostic value?: Yes

Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?: No

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

Abstract and introduction :-The descriptions should focus on DD type1 which is subclassified to four subtypes according to Neville 2009. -The description on type2 is unnecessary which makes the introduction too long.-The importance of this case as well as its unusual or unexpected presentations should be mentioned.

*Case presentation: -The patient's country of residence must be reported.
- According to the recent literature which subtype of DD type 1 does this case represent? - Is it possible to conclude that the case is the first generation only by the family history? Because mild cases especially the DD1d variant may remain unrecognized. - The histopathological features were "consistent" ... not "inconsistent". - The histopathologic report in details is unnecessary. - It is recommended to add a polarized light view of the tooth with related description because it is more reliable and representative of the disease compared to the stereomicroscopic examination.

*The discussion must focus on this case, its uniqueness as well the differences with other reported cases especially local ones.*

*References:* - There should be no more than 15 references. It is recommended to limit the references to the most related to the subject. - References #1 and 17 should be corrected. - A new edition (2009) exists for reference #7 which the authors are referred to for the subclassification of the disease.

*Figures:* - Figures 5, 6 and 7 are not directly related to the case presentation. - Figure 8 is not clear enough to show the representative details of the case. As previously mentioned, for these cases, a polarized light microscopic view is recommended instead of a stereomicroscopic one.
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