

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Dental Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJDS_130480
Title of the Manuscript:	MICROVASCULAR RECONSTRUCTION OF MANDIBLE USING FREE FIBULA FLAPS: A Systematic Review
Type of the Article	Minireview Article

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.	This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it provides a comprehensive analysis of advancements in mandibular reconstruction, focusing on the free fibula flap (FFF) as the gold standard for segmental mandibular defect repair. By assessing outcomes, risk factors, and postoperative complications, it offers valuable insights into improving surgical techniques and optimizing patient care. The findings have the potential to enhance clinical protocols, reduce complication rates, and ensure better functional and aesthetic outcomes for patients. Furthermore, this work contributes to the growing body of knowledge on microvascular surgical innovations, paving the way for future research and improvements in reconstructive maxillofacial surgery.	The manuscript is actually a comparative evaluation of the merits of free fibula flap over other options in reconstructing the segmental defects of the mandible. The mandible is the most important anatomy of the lower face it helps the person speak, chew and express emotions. Giving those functions back to the patient after ablative surgery greatly improves the patient’s quality of life and psychology. This systematic review gives the scientific community and reconstructive surgeons vitals inputs from the literature in studying the success rates of Free Fibula Flaps and choosing it as the gold standard for mandibular reconstruction.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title "MICROVASCULAR RECONSTRUCTION OF MANDIBLE USING FREE FIBULA FLAPS: A Systematic Review" is suitable as it clearly conveys the subject and scope of the manuscript. It specifies the focus on mandibular reconstruction, the use of free fibula flaps, and the systematic review methodology, making it informative and engaging for the target audience.	The title "MICROVASCULAR RECONSTRUCTION OF MANDIBLE USING FREE FIBULA FLAPS: A Systematic Review" Exactly signifies the purpose of the article and the great literature behind it. We the authors would like no change in the title whatsoever.
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.	The abstract is clear and provides a good overview of the study, but it can be improved to make it more comprehensive and aligned with standard abstract writing conventions by including the study scope, highlighting key findings, removing redundant phrases (For example "problems with mastication, swallowing, and speech can result from the interruption of the mandible's continuity," feel repetitive and could be condensed) and concluding with significance of the review.	The abstract has been edited and improved to the standards indicated by the reviewers in the final manuscript. Study scope and significance of study has been added with conclusion in final manuscript.
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Based on the content provided, the manuscript appears scientifically accurate and aligns with established knowledge in the field of mandibular reconstruction and microvascular surgery but could benefit from grammatical corrections, more references and a clearer presentation of the flow chart of how studies were included in the review	Study Criteria Flow chart has been corrected with better presentation grammatical errors have been corrected. More references have been included according to the reviewers’ suggestions.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	There are currently not enough references considering the volume of articles that were included in the review	More references have been included according to the reviewers’ suggestions in final manuscript. However articles which do no meet with the literature standard or strict inclusion criteria have been omitted as a decision from authors group to avoid data redundancy.

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language needs to be improved before publication as some phrases are redundant and not grammatically correct	Grammatical corrections have been done to original manuscript.
Optional/General comments		A vote of thanks goes to the review team from the body of authors for their comments and feedback on our manuscript.

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comments (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?	<div><div><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></div><div>No ethical issues or conflict of interest.</div></div>	<div>I agree with the reviewer, the corrections have been done / added in the original manuscript and will be submitted as final manuscript.</div> <div>Dr Bikram Rana, Postgraduate Resident Department Of Oral And Maxillofacial Surgery. ITS Dental College, Hospital And Research Centre, Greater Noida.</div>