

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_129821
Title of the Manuscript:	"Comparison Between Retromandibular Anteroparotid Approach, Retromandibular Transparotid Approach And High Subangulomandibular Approach For Mandibular Subcondylar Fracture Fixation : A Prospective Randomised Study"
Type of the Article	A PROSPECTIVE RANDOMISED STUDY"

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

#### **PART 1: Comments**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	"The paper covers important and informative topics that contribute significantly to the field. However, it would benefit from a clearer structure and more concise summarization of the key points. A more organized presentation of the approaches and methodologies, along with streamlined sections, could enhance readability and improve the overall flow of the paper. I accept the paper for publication with these considerations in mind."	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	yes	

**Review Form 3**

<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>Would be refined and organized like:  <b>Background:</b> Condylar fractures remain a subject of ongoing debate in the field of oral and maxillofacial surgery. The choice of surgical approach depends on various functional and aesthetic considerations. This study compares three surgical approaches—retromandibular anteroparotid approach, retromandibular transparotid approach, and high subangulomandibular approach—by evaluating facial nerve injury, scar aesthetics, and sialocele formation.</p> <p><b>Materials and Methods:</b> A prospective study was conducted at the Sanjay Gandhi Institute of Trauma and Orthopedics, Bangalore, involving 33 patients who were divided into three groups of 11 patients each. The outcomes assessed included facial nerve injury, scar aesthetics, and sialocele formation, with follow-up for 3 months. Data analysis was performed using the Chi-square test.</p> <p><b>Results:</b> The comparison of facial nerve injury incidence between different time intervals in each group, analyzed using Cochran's Q test, revealed that 9.1% of patients in Group A (retromandibular anteroparotid approach), 36.4% in Group B (retromandibular transparotid approach), and 18.2% in Group C (high subangulomandibular approach) experienced facial nerve injury on Day 1. Group B showed a statistically significant result with a p-value of 0.02. Sialocele formation on Day 1 occurred in 27.3% of Group A, 45.5% of Group B, and none in Group C, with a statistically significant p-value of 0.04. The comparison of mean scar aesthetic scores showed <math>1.45 \pm 0.52</math> for Group A, <math>2.36 \pm 0.51</math> for Group B, and <math>2.45 \pm 0.52</math> for Group C, with a statistically significant result (<math>p = 0.001</math>). Significant differences were found between Group A and Group B (<math>p = 0.002</math>) and Group A and Group C (<math>p = 0.001</math>).  <b>Conclusion:</b> This study indicates that the retromandibular anteroparotid approach (Group A) had the least incidence of facial nerve injury and better scar aesthetics. The high subangulomandibular approach (Group C) showed the least incidence of sialocele formation, though it posed challenges in accessing the fracture site. Therefore, the high subangulomandibular approach is recommended for low subcondylar fractures rather than high subcondylar fractures.  <b>Keywords:</b> Condylar fracture, facial nerve injury, sialocele formation, scar aesthetics.</p>	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>yes</p>	
<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>"To enhance clarity and consistency, I suggest introducing the full names of the approaches first, followed by their abbreviations in parentheses (e.g., Retromandibular Anteroparotid Approach [RMTAP]). After this, the abbreviations can be used consistently throughout the paper.</p> <p>I suggest summarize statistical analysis :  The statistical analysis involved comparing the incidence of facial nerve injury at different time intervals using Cochran's Q Test and McNemar's Post hoc Test. Sialocele formation was analyzed across the three groups at various post-operative intervals using the Chi-square Test. Additionally, the mean SCAR Scale scores were compared using the Kruskal-Wallis test followed by Dunn's Post Hoc Test, while the mean scar aesthetic scores were compared between time intervals in each group using Friedman's Test.</p>	

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 2:**

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

#### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Mohamed Aboushabana</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Suez Canal University, Egypt</b>