

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 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.	
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.	
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>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Statistical Significance Threshold: There is a discrepancy in the p-value threshold for significance. In the Methods section, it's stated as $P < 0.005$, while in the Results, p-values up to 0.03 are considered significant. Typically, a threshold of $P < 0.05$ is used. Clarifying this would enhance consistency. Grammar and Clarity: 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. Ethical Considerations: Ensure that ethical approval and informed consent are mentioned in the full manuscript, as required by standard research guidelines. Keywords: Please write the keywords following the grammatical order ('Mandibular third molar' before 'triangular flap') <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>	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	improvements in scientific accuracy, referencing, structure, and clarity are necessary to enhance the study's impact.	
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"> Some references lack proper in-text citations. For example, statements on the importance of flap design and postoperative complications need direct citations. Formatting: Ensure all references follow a consistent style. Include complete details like volume, issue, and page numbers where missing. Recent Studies: Incorporate more recent studies (post-2019) to support the findings and enhance relevance. 	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>ABSTRACT:</p> <p>Keywords: The keywords are relevant and appropriately chosen. You just have to write them following the alphabetical order (M before T</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Statistical Significance Threshold: There is a discrepancy in the p-value threshold for significance. In the Methods section, it's stated as $P < 0.005$, while in the Results, p-values up to 0.03 are considered significant. Typically, a threshold of $P < 0.05$ is used. Clarifying this would enhance consistency. 2. Grammar and Clarity: 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. <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>Scientific Accuracy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statistical Analysis: The study uses the Chi-square and Student's T-tests appropriately, but the threshold for significance is incorrectly stated as $p < 0.005$. Standard practice is $p < 0.05$. Correction is needed. • Sample Size Justification: The study lacks justification for the sample size. Include a power analysis to support the adequacy of 20 patients for statistical significance. • Blinding: Clarify whether the outcome assessor was blinded to reduce bias during post-operative evaluations. <p>References:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • Formatting: Ensure all references follow a consistent style. Include complete details like volume, issue, and page numbers where missing. • Recent Studies: Incorporate more recent studies (post-2019) to support the findings and enhance relevanc <p>Structure and Flow:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abstract: Let it be more concise • Introduction: Needs a stronger rationale for the study and more literature revue on the subject • 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. • Results: Data presentation is clear, • 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. • Conclusion: Reinforce the need for larger, multicenter trials to generalize the findings. <p>Ethical Considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirm that ethical approval and patient consent are mentioned in both the methodology and the dedicated sections. 	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Racha Hajj
Department, University & Country	Saint Joseph University, School of Dentistry, Lebanon