

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_80632
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of the Intra and Postoperative Outcomes between 3-D Plates versus 2.0 mm Miniplates in Displaced Mandibular Angle Fractures
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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:

<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>

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>Conclusions the conclusion part is a bit short. you could add the introduction part in the conclusions following the assertions you wrote in the introduction and discussion as: "The large free areas between the plate arms and minimal dissection permit good blood supply to the bone. The 3D system is easy to use and cost effective. Further, it uses lesser hardware as compared to conventional miniplates." "fewer complications related to paresthesia, infection and hardware failure" moreover, a forecast on the future of these techniques could be added, based on the observations made, specifying whether further studies could be needed in this regard.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Discussion a part could be added to the discussion which analyzes the possibility that these techniques are operator-dependent. it could be a limitation or a disadvantage and it could change the time of operations (3d/no 3d)</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>The paper is well structured, but the spelling must be carefully reviewed. I suppose there is a problem with the bibliography, as the articles cited in the text arrive at numbers 80,81... and in the references section only 26 articles are cited (maybe I'm not viewing the bibliographic section well). Abstract Good. You have to correct only "3Dnplate" Introduction: There are sentences to correct as: "Certain structural and functional peculiarities thinner compact plate, shape changes during life and frequent impacted or partially erupted teeth, bilateral muscle cover and endosseous and extra osseous blood circulation condition like peculiarities of the treatment of the fracture" I think you mean this: there are Certain structural and functional peculiarities as thinner compact cortical plate, shape changes during life and frequent impacted or partially erupted teeth, bilateral muscle cover and endosseous and extra osseous blood circulation condition like peculiarities to consider of the treatment of the fracture You must divide by "." The two sentences: There is no local data available on this topic so the aim of my study is to compare intraoperative and post-operative outcomes between mini plates and 3D plates for the management of mandibular angle fracture this study will help in identifying the technique which will provide better stability with compact size and decrease torsional movement improving overall treatment outcomes and it will lessen the operating time. MATERIALS AND METHODS: The title of this section must be corrected Results You have to add":" in this sentence to well describe: A total of 60 patient having mandibular angle fractures were randomly allocated into groups 30 were treated with 2mm conventional miniplates in table 2 is almost graphically superimposed on figure 1 the description of table 3 is anticipated in relation to the position of the table (maybe I'm not viewing this section well).</p>	

PART 2:

Review Form 1.6

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Laura Pittari
Department, University & Country	Vita-Salute San Raffaele University, Italy