

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	MANDIBULAR FRACTURES
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3759
Title of the Manuscript:	MANDIBULAR FRACTURES
Type of the Article	Complete Book

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This type of content structure may help young doctors grasp both the theoretical and practical aspects of initial diagnosis and manage mandibular fracture, building their confidence in treating patients with this condition.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Mandibular Fractures: Essential Insights for Early Career Clinicians	
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.	yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	ok	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	While this manuscript on mandibular fractures provides a practical framework for junior clinicians, its scientific robustness and technical soundness may be questioned due to a lack of detailed exploration of emerging research and advanced techniques. Some areas, such as the latest advancements in 3D imaging, personalized treatment plans, or the use of regenerative medicine, are not adequately addressed. Additionally, the manuscript might oversimplify certain complex clinical scenarios, potentially leaving out nuanced discussions about rare or highly complex mandibular fracture patterns.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	Out of the 47 references cited, only 15-17 are from recent years (2019-2024). Given that the topic of mandibular fractures is well-established, there is ongoing research in this field that introduces new techniques, technologies, and approaches. It is important for this manuscript to incorporate these recent updates, even if not in full detail, at least to acknowledge the latest advancements. Without such references, the manuscript may appear outdated and fail to reflect the current state of research and clinical practice in mandibular fracture management. Including these recent developments, even briefly, would enhance the manuscript's relevance and scientific accuracy.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Can be modified.	
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form2](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Madhumita Srivastava
Department, University & Country	Bokaro General Hospital, India