

Review of: "Primary Surgical Treatment of Cleft Palates in the Algerian Hospital Environment"

Carlo Lajolo¹

¹ Catholic University of the Sacred Heart

Potential competing interests: The author(s) declared that no potential competing interests exist.

Primary Surgical Treatment of Cleft Palates in the Algerian Hospital Environment

Brief Summary

It was a pleasure to conduct the review of the work entitled "Primary Surgical Treatment of Cleft Palates in the Algerian Hospital Environment", in which the Authors conducted a retrospective study to make to an epidemiological, therapeutic, and evolutionary analysis, and also to take stock of the surgical techniques practiced in their country for the primary treatment of cleft palates.

Nevertheless, some major changes are needed to make it suitable for publication, so the paper is not suitable for publication in the current form.

The main point that requires your attention is a methodological aspect.

Below, you can find some considerations about the paper.

Broad Comments

1. Article Title

Is the title of the manuscript brief, appropriate, and indicative of the material which is contained in the manuscript?

Somehow. The authors should add the design of the study (retrospective / observational study)

2. Abstract

Is the abstract concise? *Yes.*

Does it adequately describe the study? *Yes.*

Are the results and significances adequately presented? *Yes*

3. Introduction: Review of the Literature

Has the author cited the pertinent, but only the pertinent, literature? *Somehow. The authors should give more information regarding the diagnosis, the classification and the sequelae of primary surgical treatment.*

Is the length of the introduction and the literature review appropriate or excessive? *It is appropriate.*

4. Statement of Objectives

Is there a clear statement of the objectives of the study? *Yes*

Are the objectives justified by the introduction? *Yes.*

5. Description of Study Design: Material and Methods

Are the methods used in the study scientifically valid and technically correct? *Not at all. The authors should describe in a proper manner the design of the study: retrospective, observational study. No info regarding ethical committee. Moreover, describe in a sounder way the follow-up of the included patients; please provide a detailed comment regarding the criteria of inclusion and exclusion of patients.*

Are the procedures described in sufficient detail for a clear understanding? *Somehow. The procedures are described in a clear manner. No description regarding the selection of the surgical technique.*

Were the outcome criteria identified and were they objectively and reliably measured? *No description about the main outcome and the secondary outcome.*

6. Statistical Analysis

Were the methods of statistical analysis appropriate for the study? *No info regarding the statistical analysis.*

Did the author appropriately interpret significance and non-significance correctly? *Yes.*

Is review by a statistician needed? *Yes or No? Yes*

7. Results

Are the results and data gathered in the study presented in a clear and logical method? *Unfortunately, the section under results is extremely heavy to read. Try to make the manuscript more fluent by using the tables to report some data. Moreover, no information has been provided on the analysis of the main risk factors: can some information be extrapolated about the risk factors of postoperative complications? there is some correlation between the post-operative assessment (radiographical, speech therapy examination, aerophonoscope assessment?)*

Are tables and figures used to illustrate the data? *Somehow. The figures are not in English language. I would like to make few suggestions: use tablets to present data to the reader in such a way that it's easy to make sense of your findings.*

8. Discussion

Does the author explain the importance of his findings? *Yes.*

Are the results of this study discussed in light of other studies? *Yes.*

Are the comparisons with other studies appropriate and insightful? *Yes.*

9. Conclusions

Are the conclusions consistent with the data and results presented in the manuscript? *Yes.*

Are the conclusions warranted by the results? *Yes.*

Are the conclusions overstated, too broad, or inappropriate, based on the data presented? *No.*

10. Figures

Are the figures appropriate in number and clarity? *No. too much and not in English language.*

Do the illustrations need to be printed in color? *Yes*

11. References

Are the references current and accurate? *Yes.*

Are important references omitted? *None.*

If excessive, which should be deleted? *None.*

12. Grammar and Style

This article has not significant errors and its interpretation is easy to achieve.