

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR 52452

Date: 25/6/2025

**Title: "Diode Laser-Assisted Maxillary Labial Frenectomy: A Case Report"**

### Recommendation:

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

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

Reviewer Name: Dr. Vasudha Kommu

Date: 25/6/2025

### Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

*(To be published with the manuscript in the journal)*

*The reviewer is requested to provide a brief comment (3-4 lines) highlighting the significance, strengths, or key insights of the manuscript. This comment will be Displayed in the journal publication alongside with the reviewers name.*

This manuscript titled "**Diode Laser-Assisted Maxillary Labial Frenectomy: A Case Report**" effectively demonstrates the clinical advantages of diode laser-assisted maxillary labial frenectomy in a 20-year-old male patient. The procedure resulted in minimal bleeding, no need for sutures, reduced postoperative discomfort, and rapid healing, highlighting the diode laser as a safe, effective, and patient-friendly alternative to conventional surgical methods for aberrant frenum attachments. The detailed procedural steps and discussion of laser properties make this a valuable contribution to understanding modern frenectomy techniques.

As a single case report, the findings are not generalizable to a larger patient population and lack comparative data for statistical validation. The short follow-up period of two weeks provides only immediate healing assessment, without long-term stability or recurrence data.

# International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

[www.journalijar.com](http://www.journalijar.com)

---

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Recommendation: Accept with minor revisions

### *Detailed Reviewer's Report*

1. **Study Design (Case Report):** This is a single case report, which by nature, provides detailed insights into one specific patient's treatment. However, findings from a case report are not generalizable to a broader patient population. It does not provide statistical evidence of the diode laser's superiority over conventional methods on a larger scale.
2. **Lack of Comparative Data:** The study does not include a control group or comparison with a traditional scalpel technique in the same study, which would be necessary to objectively quantify the stated advantages (e.g., reduced pain, faster healing, minimal scarring) of the diode laser. While the introduction references studies for these advantages, the present case report does not provide new comparative data.
3. **Limited Follow-up Duration:** The follow-up period was only two weeks. While initial healing was complete and uneventful, a longer follow-up period (e.g., 6 months, 1 year, or more) would provide more comprehensive information on long-term stability, potential for relapse, scarring characteristics, and aesthetic outcomes over time.
4. **Absence of Quantitative Pain/Swelling Assessment:** While the abstract and discussion mention reduced postoperative discomfort and minimal swelling, these are subjective observations from a single patient. Quantitative pain scales (e.g., VAS scores) or objective measurements of swelling would strengthen these claims.