

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Research and Reports in Dentistry</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJRRD_129956
Title of the Manuscript:	ENVELOPE FLAP VERSUS TRIANGULAR FLAP (WARD’S INCISION) DESIGN IN MANDIBULAR THIRD MOLAR DISIMPACTION: A PROSPECTIVE COMPARATIVE CLINICAL STUDY
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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 study addresses a relevant clinical question by comparing two surgical flap designs for mandibular third molar extraction. The methodology is sound, and the results provide useful insights.	Thanks for the comments.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is concise and clearly reflects the study's aim.	Thanks for the comments.

### Review Form 3

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><b>Recommendations:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Statistical Significance Threshold:</b> There is a discrepancy in the p-value threshold for significance. In the Methods section, it's stated as <math>P &lt; 0.005</math>, while in the Results, p-values up to 0.03 are considered significant. Typically, a threshold of <math>P &lt; 0.05</math> is used. Clarifying this would enhance consistency.</li> <li><b>Grammar and Clarity:</b> Minor grammatical errors are present. "in a single appointment, one flap technique was performed and after about a month, another technique was performed on the contralateral side" could be rephrased for clarity.</li> <li><b>Ethical Considerations:</b> Ensure that ethical approval and informed consent are mentioned in the full manuscript, as required by standard research guidelines.</li> <li><b>Keywords:</b> Please write the keywords following the grammatical order ('Mandibular third molar' before 'triangular flap')</li> </ol> <p>Overall, the abstract is well-structured and provides a clear summary of the study. Addressing the above recommendations will enhance its clarity and alignment with standard research reporting guidelines.</p>	<p>1.It was a typing error P value was <math>P &lt; 0.05</math> and P-value of 0.003 was consider significant, typing error has been corrected in abstract result and result section.</p> <p>2. Grammatical correction and rephrasing of mentioned sentence has been done as, "one side of jaw receives an envelope flap, and the other side receives triangular flap randomly with a gap of one month".</p> <p>3. Ethical approval and informed consent has been mentioned in the full manuscript in methodology and in discussion section.</p> <p>4. Keywords has been rearranged according to grammatical order.</p>
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	improvements in scientific accuracy, referencing, structure, and clarity are necessary to enhance the study's impact.	Improvement in manuscript has been done after the reviews, referencing has been rearranged according to Vancouver referencing style.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some references lack proper in-text citations. For example, statements on the importance of flap design and postoperative complications need direct citations.</li> <li>Formatting: Ensure all references follow a consistent style. Include complete details like volume, issue, and page numbers where missing.</li> <li>Recent Studies: Incorporate more recent studies (post-2019) to support the findings and enhance relevance.</li> </ul>	<p>Reference no.3 has been now given to importance of flap design and reference no.14 has been given to postoperative complication.</p> <p>Formatting of all references has been rearranged according to Vancouver referencing style.</p> <p>More recent studies post 2019 has been incorporated.</p>
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p><b>ABSTRACT:</b></p> <p><b>Keywords:</b> The keywords are relevant and appropriately chosen.You just have to write them following the alphabetical order ( M before T</p> <p><b>Recommendations:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Statistical Significance Threshold:</b> There is a discrepancy in the p-value threshold for significance. In the Methods section, it's stated as <math>P &lt; 0.005</math>, while in the Results, p-values up to 0.03 are considered significant. Typically, a threshold of <math>P &lt; 0.05</math> is used. Clarifying this would enhance consistency.</li> <li><b>Grammar and Clarity:</b> Minor grammatical errors are present. For instance, "in a single appointment, one flap technique was performed and after about a month, another technique was performed on the contralateral side" could be rephrased for clarity.</li> </ol> <p>Overall, the abstract is well-structured and provides a clear summary of the study. Addressing the above recommendations will enhance its clarity and alignment with standard research reporting guidelines.</p> <p><b>Scientific Accuracy:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Statistical Analysis:</b> The study uses the Chi-square and Student's T-tests appropriately, but the threshold for significance is incorrectly stated as <math>p &lt; 0.005</math>. Standard practice is <math>p &lt; 0.05</math>. Correction is needed.</li> <li><b>Sample Size Justification:</b> The study lacks justification for the sample size. Include a power analysis to support the adequacy of 20 patients for statistical significance.</li> </ul>	<p>Keywords has been rearranged according to alphabetical order.</p> <p>1.It was a typing error P value was <math>P &lt; 0.05</math> and P-value of 0.003 was consider significant, typing error has been corrected in abstract result and result section.</p> <p>2. Grammatical correction and rephrasing of mentioned sentence has been done as,"one side of jaw receives an envelope flap, and the other side receives triangular flap randomly with a gap of one month".</p> <p><b>Scientific Accuracy:</b></p> <p><b>Statistical Analysis :</b>Correction of P-value has been as <math>P &lt; 0.05</math></p> <p><b>Sample Size Justification:</b> 1. Feasibility: this is a single center study conducted in a oral and maxillofacial surgery department with limited patient population, in that we need symmetrical bilateral impacted mandibular third molar in particular age group, recruiting a large number of patients with this conditions was challenging.</p> <p>2.Resource Constraints: This single center study was having limited resources, like financial constraints, limited personnel. Small sample size was necessary to stay within the budget and timeline of the study.</p> <p>3.Pilot study: small sample size was sufficient to gather preliminary data and inform the design of a larger study. Sample size determination and power analysis was done by G*</p>

Review Form 3

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Blinding: Clarify whether the outcome assessor was blinded to reduce bias during post-operative evaluations.</li></ul> <p>References:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>In-text Citations: Some references lack proper in-text citations. For example, statements on the importance of flap design and postoperative complications need direct citations.</li><li>Formatting: Ensure all references follow a consistent style. Include complete details like volume, issue, and page numbers where missing.</li><li>Recent Studies: Incorporate more recent studies (post-2019) to support the findings and enhance relevanc</li></ul> <p>Structure and Flow:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Abstract: Let it be more concise</li><li>Introduction: Needs a stronger rationale for the study and more literature revue on the subject</li><li>Methods: The methodology is clear but could benefit from a flowchart summarizing the patient selection, randomization, and evaluation timeline. Clarify the type and brand of sutures used and specify postoperative care instructions.</li><li>Results: Data presentation is clear,</li><li>Discussion: Expand on how the results compare to existing literature and discuss clinical implications in more depth. Discuss potential reasons for the observed differences between the flap designs beyond pain and swelling.</li><li>Conclusion: Reinforce the need for larger, multicenter trials to generalize the findings.</li></ul> <p>Ethical Considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Confirm that ethical approval and patient consent are mentioned in both the methodology and the dedicated sections.</li></ul>	<p>Power statistical software.</p> <p>Blinding: This was a randomized single blinded, split-mouth study in which postoperative examination and surveys were done by oral and maxillofacial surgery resident who don't know the study design.</p> <p>References:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Reference no.3 has been now given to importance of flap design and reference no.14 has been given to postoperative complication.</li><li>Formatting of all references has been rearranged according to Vancouver referencing style.</li><li>Recent studies post 2019 has been incorporated.</li></ul> <p>Structure and Flow:</p> <p>Abstract: Abstract has been made more concise.</p> <p>Introduction: more review of literature added to introduction.</p> <p>3-0 black braided silk suture was used and postoperative instruction has been added to methodology.</p> <p>Discussion: results compare to existing literature has been added, clinical implication and potential reasons has been discussed.</p> <p>Conclusion: Need for larger and multicenter trials to generalize the findings has been added to conclusion.</p> <p>Ethical Considerations:</p> <p>Ethical approval and patient consent has been mentioned in both the methodology and the discussion sections.</p>
--	--	--

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	