



REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-57464

Title: Malignant External Otitis: A Retrospective Study of 22 Cases.

Recommendation:

Accept after major revision

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

Reviewer's ID: JPR-198

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Major Revision (borderline rejection if not improved significantly)

This manuscript presents a retrospective analysis of 22 cases of malignant external otitis (MEO). The topic is clinically relevant, especially in ENT and infectious disease practice. However, the manuscript has limited novelty, small sample size, and largely descriptive analysis, with substantial issues in structure, language, scientific depth and particularly the absence of a reference list despite multiple in-text citations. Major revision is required, and in its current form it is borderline for publication.

Major Comments

1. **Missing Reference List**

The manuscript contains multiple in-text citations ([1]–[22]) but no corresponding reference section. This makes verification of statements impossible and must be corrected.

2. **Limited Novelty and Scientific Contribution** - Findings (diabetes association, *Pseudomonas* predominance, imaging role) are already well established. No new insights or hypothesis-driven analysis are provided.

3. **Small Sample Size and Descriptive Analysis** - Only 22 cases over several years with **no statistical analysis or outcome predictors**. This limits scientific value.

4. **Overly Long and Non-focused Discussion** - The discussion is excessively descriptive and textbook-like, with minimal linkage to study findings.

5. **Methodological Clarity** - Diagnostic criteria are complex and not clearly standardized. No information on missing data or bias handling.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Minor Comments

1. Language requires editing (long sentences, spacing issues).
2. No tables/figures summarizing key results.
3. Outcome definition ("favorable") is vague.
4. Formatting inconsistencies throughout.