

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_80884
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARISON OF PREAURICULAR VERSUS RETROMANDIBULAR APPROACH IN THE MANAGEMENT OF MANDIBULAR CONDYLE 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	Materials and Methods <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Who and how reviewed the complications of both groups?. - Timeline of complications, early or delayed?. How often were the patients followed? 	
Minor REVISION comments	Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>“However each of these incisions has varying degrees of complication due to proximity to vital structures namely facial nerve and parotid gland”</i>. Use types of complications instead degrees. - <i>Hinds and girotti were the first to report the retro mandibular technique</i>. Use Girotti (first capital letter) and add the year of publication technique. - Different study reported the different rate of complications with different techniques for fractures of the mandibular condyle. Three times “Different” word in one sentence please uses synonymous Data collection procedure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>“documented permission form”</i>. Use informed consent - <i>“On the Proforma, participant information such as name, age, gender, and hospital registration number were entered”</i>. Use “were registered” Procedure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>“For group A (preauricular incision) an oblique incision is made through the tissues near the root of zygoma to enter the joint capsule and expose the condylar fracture”</i>. What type of blade were used? - <i>“Reduction is done using miniplates osteosynthesis and closure done with resorbable suture”</i>. What type of miniplates were used (brand)?. In order to know if are FDA approved. Also with what type of resorbable suture. - It does not say anything of who performed surgery, how many surgeons? Conclusion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>“In our study Retro mandibular incision complications was low as compare to preauricular in the management of mandibular condyle fractures”</i>. In this descriptive study the retromandibular incision rate complication was lower than 	-
Optional/General comments	Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would be better at the beginning name the definition (author reference) of condylar fractures and then prevalence data, also, some author classification of mandible fractures for example the most common use in studies. - Could be better if the author mention advantage and disadvantage of both treatment approach, because I read only disadvantage of non surgical treatment. Maybe a comparative table. 	

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yuri Andrés Cataldo
Department, University & Country	Universidad de Chile, Chile