

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-59112

Title: Piezoelectric versus conventional osteotomy in orthognathic surgery: a systematic review stratified by timing of neurosensory assessment and by what was timed.

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:

- Relevant and clinically important topic
- Clear research question
- Systematic review approach is appropriate
- PRISMA 2020 guidance is reported
- Multiple major databases were searched
- Studies were assessed according to follow up timing
- Risk of bias was considered
- Limitations of the available evidence are openly discussed

Weakness of the study:

- Screening was mainly performed by one reviewer
- One eligible study was initially missed
- Scopus screening remains incomplete
- Embase and CENTRAL were not searched
- Protocol was not registered in PROSPERO
- Several included studies have methodological limitations
- Some data rely on secondary sources
- Statistical pooling was limited by heterogeneous reporting

Reviewers Comments:

The manuscript addresses an important clinical question regarding neurosensory recovery after piezoelectric and conventional osteotomy. The time based analysis is interesting and provides a useful interpretation of the conflicting literature. The authors have appropriately reported that ethical clearance is not applicable because this is a systematic review of published literature with no new participants. However, major revision is recommended. The main concern is the single reviewer screening process, particularly because eligible studies were initially missed. Scopus screening is incomplete and the protocol was not prospectively registered. Several included studies have small samples, nonrandomized designs, incomplete reporting and possible confounding. Some risk ratios are also based on side level data without adequate correction for clustering. The conclusions are generally cautious, but should remain closely linked to the low certainty of evidence. Grammar, sentence construction, spacing and overall scientific writing should also be carefully edited. Overall, the manuscript is valuable but requires methodological clarification before publication.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Previously Published anywhere/Plagiarism check:

An exact title search did not identify the same publication. However, closely related systematic reviews on piezoelectric versus conventional osteotomy in orthognathic surgery were published in 2017 and 2022, with similar objectives and outcomes. pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov The present manuscript has a different time stratified approach. A formal similarity check is recommended before publication.