

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Research and Reports in Dentistry
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 advent of patient-centred dentistry has motivated clinicians and researchers towards formulating novel techniques and re-evaluating the existing ones to device more patient-friendly methods in dentistry. The present submission compared two existing surgical flap designs for mandibular 3 rd molar extraction, that is envelope flap and triangular flap, in terms of post-operative healing and patient reported outcomes. It can benefit dental practitioners by throwing light on the pros and cons of both the techniques.	Thanks for the comments.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of the article is suitable	
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 results section of the abstract should be more elaborate and must mention which outcome was more in which group. For example if pain scores and swelling were significantly higher in envelope flap group, it should be mentioned here as well.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically sound, but I have the following concerns: 1. The inclusion and exclusion criteria have not been described in the methodology section. 2. How was the sample size determined? 3. No references have been provided for the Pell and Gregory classification and Difficulty index. There are several difficulty indices for 3 rd molar extraction, kindly mention which one was used. 4. Kindly mention why was a 30-day gap given between two operations in the same patient. The importance of this interval can be mentioned in the discussion section. 5. The authors have mentioned, "All patients were given standard dose of prophylactic antibiotics and anti-inflammatory agents". How was this dose defined and which were the drugs used? Kindly provide relevant reference if the regimen was adapted from a previous study. 6. Authors have mentioned facial skin preparation in "operative procedure" section. How was this preparation carried out? 7. Authors have stated the use of "mersilk" suture in 3 rd paragraph of section 2.1. Mersilk is a brand name, and it should be replaced with a more generic term such as "braided silk suture".	1.The inclusion and exclusion criteria have been described in methodology section 2. Sample size determination and power analysis was done by G* Power statistical software. 3.Reference no. is given to Pell and Gregory classification and reference no. is given to Difficulty index. Pederson difficulty index was used. 4. Gap of one month was kept between two surgeries because complete healing of wound takes 4-6 weeks ²² , once one side is completely healed it was useful for chewing food on that side, as the surgical site was completely healed till 4 th week there was less chances of error in measuring data of two sides, same gap was also given in other similar studies. 5.Dose was determined according to patients body weight. Drugs started 1 day prior to surgery & continued for 3 days postoperatively. All patients were given capsule amoxicillin (500mg /8 hours), tablet ibuprofen (400 mg/6 hours) and mouthwash of chlorhexidine 0.2% for 7 days. Dose of drug was

Review Form 3

	<p>8. Discussion section has a repetition of results. The complete statistical data has already been given in the “Results” section along with the associated tables and graphs. There is no need to re-mention it in the discussion. The discussion should instead focus on the comparison of the author’s findings with the existing literature. Kindly add more studies to the discussion for comparison with the findings of your study.</p> <p>9. I would also like to suggest that instead of discussing the p-values again and again, the authors should focus more on the clinical implications of their findings. For example, they may discuss the significance of post-operative healing for patients as well as clinicians, and why or why not should a particular flap (envelope or triangular), be chosen for 3rd molar extraction. Additionally, the indications and contraindications of each flap can be mentioned.</p> <p>10. Limitations of the study need to be mentioned in the discussion.</p> <p>11. Kindly discuss the clinical significance of wound gaping during post-surgical phase. The references should be reassessed for missing references (17, 30 and 37).</p>	<p>determined according to body weight of patient and from the similar study¹⁷.</p> <p>6. . Facial skin preparation was done using betadine scrub.</p> <p>7. 3-0 black braided silk suture.</p> <p>8. Repeated result has been removed from discussion, comparison with existing studies added and more studies added to discussion</p> <p>9.clinical implication of finding added to study with advantages and complication of each flap.</p> <p>10.limitation of study mentioned in this study</p> <p>Limitation of the study: This study was carried out in the department of Oral & Maxillofacial surgery of CSMSS Dental college and hospital between the year January 2021 to October 2022, limitation of this study which affected to generalize findings were single centre study, small sample size, short duration of study. Circumferential facial measurements are not representative of total swelling because oedema has three planes of measurements.</p> <p>11. clinical significance of wound gaping during post-surgical phase has been discuss in discussion section.</p> <p>12. All references has been reassessed for missing references .</p>
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	<p>The references are not in a uniform format, kindly use the same referencing format for each reference.</p> <p>Also, additional references must be provided for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pell and Gregory classification (methodology paragraph 1) 2. Difficulty index (methodology paragraph 1) 3. In paragraph 1 of discussion, the epidemiological incidence for 3rd molar impaction has been stated as 17%-32%, kindly provide the reference. 4. The paragraph 2 of discussion mentions reference number 30, which is missing in the references section. 5. Paragraph 3 of discussion mentions NIH consensus development conference, kindly provide the reference for the consensus report, if available. 6. The 9th paragraph of discussion mentions a study by Erdogan et al, but a reference for the same is missing. 7. The reference number 37, mentioned in last paragraph of discussion is missing. 	<p>All the reference has been rearranged in Vancouver reference style.</p> <p>1.Reference no.15 is given to Pell and Gregory classification.</p> <p>2. Reference no.16 is given to Difficulty index.</p> <p>3. Epidemiological incidence percent 17-32% was a autocorrection mistake of number, the sentence has been rephrased and reference no. 19 is given to it.The epidemiological incidence of their impaction ranges from 9.8%-68% in different population¹⁹.</p> <p>4.all references are rearranged.</p> <p>5.Not able to find reference for paragraph so it has been removed from the manuscript.</p> <p>6.reference no. 25 is given to Erdogan et al. study</p> <p>7.all references are rearranged.</p>
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p>The authors were able to communicate their findings well but the language of this submission can benefit greatly from a grammar check, as there are several grammatical errors. The first few lines of methodology section have used present perfect tense, while rest of the text has past tense. Also, the points 4 and 5 of Assessment Criteria section have used future tense.</p> <p>I suggest consistent use of past tense in the methodology section as the study has already been completed.</p>	<p>Sorry for the grammatical mistake, past tense has been now used in assessment criteria and methodology.</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>I would like to congratulate the authors for successfully completing this study. A few improvisations can significantly improve the scientific communicability of this submission.</p> <p>No ethical issues could be noted.</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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	