Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JAMMR_130177**
Title of the Manuscript:	**USE OF SINGLE MINI-PLATE VERSUS TWO MINIPLATES OSTEOSYNTHESIS FOR LINEAR NON-COMMINUTED FRACTURE OF ANTERIOR MANDIBLE: A PROSPECTIVE RANDOMIZED COMPARATIVE 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** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
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 importance of this manuscript, is that it handles an everyday procedure facing a maxillofacial surgeon; fracture mandible, plus handling a very debated issue; single or double plate using. Mentioning the benefits or primary bone healing during ORIF is indeed a valuable addition.**	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	**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.	**I noticed repeating the epidemiology of mandibular fracture in the abstract, introduction, discussion and conclusions with no additional informations from the first to the last mentions. Please add new data moving from one sector to other or mention it only once.**	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	**Indeed, it is a very significant manuscript.**	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	**The references are quite sufficient, but not recent enough. I found the most recent 2 out of 25 (only 8%) of references belongs to the year 2019.**	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	**The language quality is suitable, but I have a single note; Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Osteosynthesefragen (Working Group for Osteosynthesis Issues), the article is in English language, so please write the English translation, so the reader wouldn't be dissociated and search for translation.**	
Optional/General comments	**I found your article very beneficial and demonstrative.** Dear authors, I found your article very interesting as it is concerned with every day operation for a maxillofacial surgeon. Indeed, your article leaves a good impression. I would like to demonstrate my opinion regarding the following points: 1. Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Osteosynthesefragen (Working Group for Osteosynthesis Issues), the article is in English language, so please write the English translation, so the reader wouldn't be dissociated and search for translation. 2. You mentioned the benefits of primary bone healing during ORIF and this a good note regarding healing process. I see it will be better to give a small hint between mechanisms of bone healing during both closed and open reduction (primary and secondary bone healing). 3. What about the mechanism of trauma? I understood that all the patients had low impact force traumas. If you mentioned the trauma mechanisms, we could to somehow construct an idea about the epidemiology of mandibular trauma in your territory inspite of the small sample's size (20 patients). 4. What about the size of screws used for fixing the inferior plate in the second group??? Was it the same as those used in the superior one??? Usually, they are of smaller size, but if the used ones were of the same size as the superior ones, could it initiate some sort of debate?? Pleases clarify the size of the used screws. I noticed repeating the epidemiology of mandibular fracture in the abstract, introduction, discussion and conclusions with no additional informations from the first to the last mentions. Please add new data moving from one sector to other or mention it only once.	

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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Nada Ahmed Mohamed Elsayed Taha**
Department, University & Country	**Peoples friendship university of Russia (RUDN), Russia**