

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-59023

Title: Endoscopic versus Microscopic Tympanoplasty: A Randomized Comparative Study

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 ID: JP085

Reviewers Comment for Publication.

The study compares endoscopic and microscopic tympanoplasty in 44 patients. The endoscopic method showed better graft uptake and shorter hospital stay. Hearing improvement was similar in both groups.

Strength:

1. The topic is useful and clinically important.
2. The study has a prospective randomized design.
3. Both groups had 22 patients.
4. The surgical procedure is explained clearly.
5. Patients were followed for 6 months.
6. Graft uptake and hearing outcomes were evaluated.
7. The results are supported by statistical analysis.

Weakness:

1. The sample size is small.
2. The randomization method is not explained clearly.
3. No sample-size calculation is given.
4. The two groups had different perforation sizes, which may affect the results.
5. Statistical methods are not described in enough detail.
6. Operative time and complications are not reported clearly.
7. Reference formatting needs improvement.
8. Some conclusions are stronger than the results support.

Overall assessment:

The article is interesting and clinically useful. The endoscopic technique showed good graft uptake and shorter hospital stay, but hearing results were similar between the two groups. However, the small sample size, differences in perforation size, unclear randomization details, and limited statistical information need to be improved.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Recommendation: Manuscript accepted for publication after minor revision.