

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR 52749

Date: 12/7/2025

Title: "A Synergistic Approach to Treat Class II Division 2 Malocclusion in a Post Pubertal Phase Using Bio-Progressive philosophy and Fixed Functional Appliance"

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: 12/7/2025

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 **"A Synergistic Approach to Treat Class II Division 2 Malocclusion in a Post Pubertal Phase Using Bio-Progressive philosophy and Fixed Functional Appliance"** meticulously details the successful orthodontic management of a Class II Division 2 malocclusion in a post-pubertal patient, integrating the Bio-Progressive philosophy with a fixed functional appliance (Forsus™ Fatigue Resistant Device). The clear, sequential protocol, encompassing incisor decompensation, sagittal correction, and comprehensive biomechanical control, demonstrates effective resolution of a complex malocclusion. The positive skeletal and dentoalveolar improvements, along with favorable aesthetic outcomes, highlight a well-executed treatment approach for such challenging cases.

As a single case report, the findings are not generalizable to a broader patient population, and the success observed may not be reproducible across all cases.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Recommendation: Accept with minor revisions

Detailed Reviewer's Report

1. **Study Design (Case Report):** This manuscript presents a single case report. While providing in-depth insights into a specific clinical approach and its successful outcome, the findings are inherently limited in generalizability. The results observed in one patient may not be representative of outcomes in a larger, diverse patient population with similar malocclusions.
2. **Lack of Comparative Data:** The report does not compare the outcomes of this synergistic approach to other treatment modalities for Class II Division 2 malocclusion, either in terms of effectiveness, efficiency, or stability. While literature is cited, the study itself does not provide comparative data.
3. **Subjectivity in Aesthetic Assessment:** While facial esthetics are noted to be enhanced, the assessment of these improvements is largely subjective. Objective aesthetic evaluation methods or patient-reported outcome measures could strengthen this aspect.
4. **Post-pubertal Phase Challenges:** The study addresses treatment in a "post-pubertal phase," where growth modification potential is reduced compared to younger patients. While successful in this case, the effectiveness of the functional appliance in later stages of growth can vary, and this case alone cannot fully illustrate the overall predictability in this demographic.