



Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,
315-321 Lockhart Road,
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Stomatology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 3601

Title: Surgical obturator duplicating original tissue-form helps restoring postoperative esthetics and function in oral cancer patients: A technique and clinical report

Reviewer code: 00742466

Science editor: Zhai, Huan-Huan

Date sent for review: 2013-05-09 21:47

Date reviewed: 2013-05-18 23:31

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Well written case report. No major changes are required.



Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,
315-321 Lockhart Road,
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Stomatology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 3601

Title: Surgical obturator duplicating original tissue-form helps restoring postoperative esthetics and function in oral cancer patients: A technique and clinical report

Reviewer code: 00742424

Science editor: Zhai, Huan-Huan

Date sent for review: 2013-05-09 21:47

Date reviewed: 2013-05-21 09:08

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It was a well-written and systematically organized. Here are some issues which should be discussed in the manuscript: 1. It seems this paper is duplication of what the authors have published before (reference 9, 10). It will be advisable to discuss the differences. 2. How about the thickness of the buccal flanges especially at the resected site? Will it influence the tissue responses after the healing period? 3. It will become a stronger evidence if the authors can do a clinical trial comparing immediate and delay obturator in terms of contracture and scarring. 4. The authors should show an photo of patient wearing immediate obturator immediately after surgery to compare with 6 month appearance.