

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-58404

Title: Incidental detection of a bifid mandibular condyle on cone-beam computed tomography: a case report.

Recommendation:

Accept after minor revision

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

Reviewer's ID: JPR- 237

Detailed Reviewer's Report

The manuscript is well organized and written. However, some issues should be addressed before publication. The novelty of the case is limited because numerous case reports describing incidentally detected BMC on CBCT have already been published.

1. The authors should clearly explain what makes this case unique.
2. The Introduction is relatively brief and lacks a comprehensive overview of BMC. The authors should include discussion regarding like embryologic theories, developmental versus traumatic etiology, unilateral versus bilateral occurrence, mediolateral versus anteroposterior orientation.
3. Several recent CBCT studies and systematic reviews should be incorporated.
4. The authors should explain why the lesion was considered a focal osteoporotic bone marrow defect.
5. The manuscript should specify: orientation of bifidity (mediolateral or anteroposterior), dimensions of each condylar head, depth of separation, articular eminence morphology and condylar position within the fossa.
6. The Discussion does not sufficiently analyze whether these findings are attributable to the bifid condyle or merely coincidental. The authors should discuss possible functional implications, reasons why many BMC cases remain asymptomatic, whether MRI would be indicated to evaluate disc displacement.
7. The manuscript indicates referrals to several departments but provides no follow-up. A short follow-up substantially improves the value of a case report.
8. The manuscript does not mention informed consent, ethics committee approval (if required), patient consent for publication, anonymization of images. These statements should be included according to CARE guidelines and journal policy.
9. Several sentences are unnecessarily long, could be simplified.
10. Recent references should be added where appropriate.
11. The Discussion mainly repeats textbook information. It should instead compare the present case with previous reports.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT