



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Medical and Pharmaceutical Case Reports
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJMPCR_12498
Title of the Manuscript:	EXTERNAL AUDITORY CANAL FRACTURE AFTER POSTERIOR DISLOCATION OF AN INTACT CONDYLAR HEAD.
Type of the Article	Case Study

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Aims- this indicates more than one aims. This should be refined.</p> <p>Presentation of case- the acronym EAC should be defined preferably in the Introduction or Background before it is used here.</p> <p>Generally, this paper needs editorial assistance to make it better readable for the Journal.</p>	<p>We made the corrections according to your suggestion .</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Abstract</p> <p>Discussion- Once EAC is defined, only the relevant acronym need be used.</p> <p>Page 1 Lines 34-35 It is better to mention causes, then risk factors as they are not the same.</p> <p>Page 2</p> <p>Lines 62-63road accident 30days before.the woman was referred to</p> <p>Line 70 What form of zygoma fracture? There is need to clarify what is meant by 'breadth reduction' of EAC. Is that</p>	<p>We made the corrections according to your suggestion.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>the standard dimension for determining fracture of the EAC?</p> <p>Line 71 All figures mentioned should include what they refer to.</p> <p>Line 72 What approach was used to access the TMJ? As there was no mention of pre-operative ENT specialist consultation, how was the post-operative evaluation determined as 'considerable improvement.</p> <p>Lines 83-86 Why this repetition of details already presented? The available literature should be used to discuss your result (case presentation).</p> <p>Lines 87-09 Useful when related to the case presentation.</p> <p>Page 3 line 22. Since the approach to the TMJ was not mentioned in the presentation of the case, it is 'foreign matter' here.</p> <p>Generally, this paper needs editorial assistance to make it better readable for the Journal.</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		