

Review of: "Assessment of the differences in the use of free iliac flap for maxillomandibular defects with patient-reported outcomes"

Grazyna Wyszynska-Pawelec¹

¹ Jagiellonian University Cracow

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The paper "Assessment of the differences in the use of free iliac flap for maxillomandibular defects with patient-reported outcomes" is written in a poor medical English and sometimes it is difficult to understand the meaning of whole sentences. Also the title of the paper is unclear, as far as "the differences in the use of free iliac flap" is concerned. Different indications for the use of DCIA flap? If so, perhaps it is better to concentrate only on trauma patients, in comparison with other studies. In the table 3 Latin and English are mixed up. Definitely, the paper requires thorough correction of medical English.

The structure of the paper also needs detailed revision. In "Material and Methods" section clear inclusion-exclusion criteria should be indicated. All data analyzed should be mentioned in this section and according to this plan results should be presented.

Although this study is a case series with limited number of cases some effort at statistical analysis should be made. Classification of defects proposed by Urken could be presented as a diagram. Criteria for aesthetic results are not mentioned at all, and it would be proper to indicate by name the author of the questionnaire. In the "Results" section some information from the "Material and Methods" section is repeated, on the other hand some parameters are not mentioned in the previous section.

It is not clear how the blood supply of the bone was assessed after soft tissue necrosis of the flap. What measures were taken to prevent abdominal hernia formation?

I have also some doubts about comparing e.g. the length of stay in the Intensive Care Unit on the basis of references older than 10 years, as the progress in microsurgery and intensive care in the recent years is obvious.

Discussion is not a repetition of own results and this section should be revised.

In conclusion, in the present form the study does not fulfill requirements of a scientific paper and I do not recommend it for publication. The group of patients is small, there is no novelty in the design and subject of the paper, the methods used and results obtained are not objective.

