

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-58513

Title: Reconstruction of an Extensive Nasal Defect Using a Pedicled Forehead Flap and Nasolabial Flap in a Patient With Basal Cell Carcinoma: A Case Report

Recommendation:

- Accept as it is
 ✓ Accept after minor revision.....
 Accept after major revision
 Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

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

Reviewer Name: Dr S. K. Nath

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Strength of the study:

- The case presents a rare and clinically challenging reconstructive procedure
- Clinical history, surgical technique, and postoperative findings are clearly described
- High-quality clinical photographs support the surgical outcome
- The discussion is supported with recent and relevant literature
- Practical learning points are provided for reconstructive surgeons
- The manuscript follows a logical case report structure
- The conclusions are balanced and clinically relevant

Weakness of the study:

- The report is based on a single patient
- Follow-up period is too short to assess long-term outcomes
- Ethical approval or publication consent should be reported more clearly
- Functional and cosmetic outcomes were not objectively measured
- Some grammatical and formatting corrections are needed
- Discussion could compare more similar published cases
- Generalizability of the findings is limited

Reviewers Comments:

This manuscript describes a well-managed case of extensive nasal reconstruction following excision of infiltrative basal cell carcinoma in an elderly patient. The case is clinically relevant and demonstrates the successful use of a pedicled forehead flap combined with a nasolabial flap for reconstruction of a complex nasal defect. The surgical procedure is described clearly, and the clinical photographs effectively illustrate the operative steps and early postoperative outcome. The discussion is comprehensive and supported by current literature. The manuscript is generally easy to read, although minor grammatical errors and formatting inconsistencies should be corrected before publication. The authors should clearly mention ethical approval or state whether it was waived and confirm that written informed consent for publication of the case and images was obtained. The short follow-up period and absence of objective functional and aesthetic assessment are important limitations. Overall, this is an informative case report with practical clinical value and is suitable for publication after minor revision.

Previously Published anywhere/Plagiarism check:

The manuscript appears to present an original clinical case, and there is no obvious indication that it has been published previously. No clear evidence of duplicate publication was identified during this review. However, the journal should perform a routine plagiarism similarity check before publication to confirm originality and ensure compliance with publication ethics.