



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_48906
Title of the Manuscript:	The management of zygomatic complex fractures: a literature review
Type of the Article	

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>Abstract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Number of words is within the range of journal requirement. ii. It contains the aim of the research that is clearly put forward. iii. A lot of grammatical errors noted throughout the text. iv. It does not summarize what is in the manuscript. v. The information has been poorly arranged. It puts off the reader. <p>Recommendation: Please rewrite the abstract. Arrange the information basing on the aim. Write briefly on the definition of the subject matter, the different clinical features and approaches.</p> <p>Keywords:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. They are relevant. ii. Add one more keyword. <p>The Main Body</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The manuscript fails to describe the area of interest. The article does not meet the expectations of a reader, basing on such an attractive Title. ii) The rationale for the study has not been clearly put forward iii) The entire information is not well-arranged. There is no logical consistency in the entire manuscript. Example, at one point the authors are discussing treatment and within the same area, they bring up another poin like clinical features or anatomy. iv) A lot of grammatical errors noted throughout the text. v) Citation of references used not made for some sentences or phrases <p>Recommendation: The manuscript needs to be restructured and rewritten. Base the literature search around the objectives of the study. Provide a factual background, clearly defined problem, a brief literature survey and the</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p><i>scope and justification of the work done. My recommendation is to arrange the manuscript as:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Introduction: Describe the ZMC: (zygomaticomaxillary complex fracture is. Give a brief anatomical description of the region. Talk about the etiology of the ZMC fractures, and finally the incidence of the injury)</i>• <i>Clinical features of ZMC</i>• <i>The treatment methods: (observation, surgical (different approaches), advantages and disadvantages of each approach</i>• <i>Conclusion.</i>	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<p>References and citation: i) References are written as per journals guidelines Recommendation: if possible, try to use the latest studies. There are some references which are very old.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Structure and length: i) It is a moderately lengthy paper ii) The article is neither well organized nor well balanced. iii) It may have some relevant information. Recommendation: the entire article requires reorganization, thus to be re-written.</p> <p>Logic: i) The article has not been written clearly. ii) There is a significant violation of grammar though it doesn't hinder one to grab the information easily. iii) There is no logical consistency in most of the paragraphs throughout the text. Recommendation: Restructure the entire manuscript.</p> <p>English: i) The English used in the article is not very good but does convey the scientific meaning correctly. Recommendation: improvement required.</p> <p>Scientific quality rating Novelty and originality: The idea of the review is good. There is minimum contribution of the article to the knowledge pool. Importance and impact: The information in the article is insignificant currently due to some technical aspects, however, with improvement and correction of the issues raised it may be a source of summarized details required in the practice. Relevance: The article is not misleading yet it is not entirely scientific sound. Completeness of presentation: The presentation is beyond the standard for complete scientific article at its present state.</p> <p>Overall Assessment of the manuscript: The authors are firstly congratulated for showing interest in reviewing the literature basing on the zygomatic complex fractures. Despite having a good idea, the authors have failed to write a good and clear manuscript. But if it is improved, then it will be a good work.</p>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	<i>Karpal Singh Sohal</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Muhimbili University of Health And Allied Sciences, Tanzania</i>