

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-56306

Title: Management of Class II div 1 malocclusion with two phase therapy in growing child: A case report

Recommendation:

Accept after major revision

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality			✓	
Techn. Quality			✓	
Clarity				✓
Significance			✓	

Reviewer Name: Dr. Sudheer Aluru

Detailed Reviewer's Report

This manuscript presents a case report of a 12-year-old male treated for Class II division 1 malocclusion using a Twin Block appliance followed by fixed appliance therapy over 18 months. While the topic is clinically relevant, the manuscript in its current form has significant methodological, structural, and linguistic deficiencies that must be addressed before it can be considered for publication.

Major Comments

1. Title and concept do not match

- The paper is called *two-phase therapy*, but the discussion and conclusion say treatment was done as a *single phase*. (In the Discussion (page 5, lines 112–113), the authors state: “*skeletal phase and orthodontic phase combined in a single phase as the studies demonstrated that separated phases do not have any beneficial effect.*”) Additionally, the Conclusion again states “*single phase treatment Twin Block appliance followed by fixed appliance phase,*” which is internally inconsistent.
- This is a serious contradiction.
- Decide clearly: one-phase or two-phase, and correct the title, discussion, and conclusion accordingly.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

2. Nothing new is shown

- Twin Block followed by fixed appliances is standard treatment.
- The paper does not explain what is unique or why this case deserves publication.
- This must be justified clearly.

3. Cephalometric interpretation is wrong

- ANB reduced from 5° to 2° (improvement), but the discussion incorrectly says ANB “increased”.
- Several angles are written incorrectly (° shown as 0).
- Data and text must be corrected and made consistent.

4. Growth vs treatment effect not discussed properly

- Mandibular length increased by 6 mm in a growing child.
- This is likely due to pubertal growth, not only the appliance.
- The discussion does not critically separate growth changes from appliance effects.

5. No retention or follow-up information

- Retention protocol is missing.
- No post-treatment or stability follow-up is reported.
- This is an important limitation and must be addressed.

Minor Comments

6. Poor language quality

- Many grammar and sentence errors.
- Professional English editing is required.

7. Ethics and consent missing

- No statement on patient consent.
- No mention of CARE guidelines.

8. Figures need correction

- The figures are clinically informative, but figure captions are not consistently matched to figure numbering. Figure 1 is referenced in text but not formally captioned in the figures section. The labeling and in text citation are to be identical and effectively represented.

9. References need cleanup

- Some references are not relevant to the case.
- Formatting is inconsistent.