

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 84701

Title: With two episodes of right retromandibular angle subcutaneous emphysema during right upper molar crown preparation: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 00742340

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: DDS, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Doctor, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Colombia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-03-25

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-04-09 14:22

Reviewer performed review: 2023-04-14 16:08

Review time: 5 Days and 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Title: the title reflects the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript. **Abstract:** the abstract summarizes and reflects the work described in the manuscript; however, it is recommended to detail the medications prescribed and provide conclusions based on the results. For example, the presence of the fissure in the molar is an important detail that must be highlighted in the results and reflected in the conclusions. **Key Words:** the keywords reflect the focus of the manuscript; however, most of them are not MeSH terms. **Background:** the manuscript adequately describes the background, and presents the status and significance of the study; however, a brief description of case management (references 1-3; page 2, line 45) would be pertinent. On the other hand, lines 48 and 49 should be removed because they become part of the methods and are mentioned there. Moreover, at the end of the introduction it is indicated "prevention of this SURGICAL COMPLICATION". This must be clarified. **Methods.** The approval number of the bioethics committee must be added. **Case Report.** Line 63. Because periodontal pocket depth can be confusing, it is recommended to describe it as gingival sulcus depth in the absence of periodontitis. This should be adjusted throughout the manuscript. All figures



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

need to be improved. In particular, all elements that are not necessary should be eliminated (numbers, letters, lips, desks, retractors, other people, the floor, etc.). Page 3, line 90. The legend of the figures indicates the dimension in millimeters of the lateral buccal gingival sulcus. The most appropriate would be to present the dimension of the gingival sulcus in the 6 places per tooth that are generally part of a correct gingival evaluation. Discussion. Page 6, lines 167-168. The hypotheses that support a greater presence of emphysema in women should be indicated. Page 6, lines 168-171. How is this sentence related to what was observed in the present case? It seems that reference 10 is closely related to the present case. It would be appropriate to make a contrast with that case. Conclusions. Lines 200-203. They seem like recommendations that can be placed at the end of the discussion. Reference 11 is extremely old.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 84701

Title: With two episodes of right retromandibular angle subcutaneous emphysema during right upper molar crown preparation: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02921008

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: DDS

Professional title: Academic Research, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iran

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-03-25

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-04-11 20:57

Reviewer performed review: 2023-04-16 05:54

Review time: 4 Days and 8 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a good report. Please add more images. Please elaborate heavily on the diagnosis, treatment, and follow-up. In the introduction, elaborate on the rarity of this condition. Delete any statements regarding conclusions because a case report cannot convey any. Please tone down the bold sentences about the significance of this case (except the ones about its rarity).