

### 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 DISIMPACTON: 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>
<b>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.</b>	<b>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<sup>rd</sup> 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.</b>	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	<b>Yes, the title of the article is suitable</b>	
<b>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.</b>	<b>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.</b>	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	The manuscript is scientifically sound, but I have the following concerns: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The inclusion and exclusion criteria have not been described in the methodology section.</li> <li>2. How was the sample size determined?</li> <li>3. No references have been provided for the Pell and Gregory classification and Difficulty index. There are several difficulty indices for 3<sup>rd</sup> molar extraction, kindly mention which one was used.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>6. Authors have mentioned facial skin preparation in "operative procedure" section. How was this preparation carried out?</li> <li>7. Authors have stated the use of "mersilk" suture in 3<sup>rd</sup> 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".</li> <li>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</li> </ol>	

**Review Form 3**

	<p>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 3<sup>rd</sup> 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.</p> <p>The references should be reassessed for missing references (17, 30 and 37).</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>The references are not in a uniform format, kindly use the same referencing format for each reference. Also, additional references must be provided for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Pell and Gregory classification (methodology paragraph 1)</li> <li>2. Difficulty index (methodology paragraph 1)</li> <li>3. In paragraph 1 of discussion, the epidemiological incidence for 3<sup>rd</sup> molar impaction has been stated as 17%-32%, kindly provide the reference.</li> <li>4. The paragraph 2 of discussion mentions reference number 30, which is missing in the references section.</li> <li>5. Paragraph 3 of discussion mentions NIH consensus development conference, kindly provide the reference for the consensus report, if available.</li> <li>6. The 9<sup>th</sup> paragraph of discussion mentions a study by Erdogan et al, but a reference for the same is missing.</li> <li>7. The reference number 37, mentioned in last paragraph of discussion is missing.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<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. I suggest consistent use of past tense in the methodology section as the study has already been completed.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p><b>I would like to congratulate the authors for successfully completing this study. A few improvisations can significantly improve the scientific communicability of this submission.</b></p> <p>No ethical issues could be noted.</p>	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Aehad UI Haque</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>King George's Medical University, India</b>