

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-54307

Title: AMELOBLASTOMA: SURGICAL APPROACHES AND POST- RESECTION REHABILITATION

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. Sireesha Kuruganti

Date: 14/10/2025

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Below is a detailed in-depth review of the provided ameloblastoma manuscript

Abstract and Introduction (Lines 4–66)

- The abstract clearly outlines the tumor's clinical significance, treatment objectives, and the overall challenge of functional restoration after resection (lines 4–23).
- The introduction is well-structured, covers epidemiology, clinical presentation, and high recurrence rates. However, adding explicit incidence and prevalence data would add value (lines 29–54).
- The manuscript effectively raises issues of controversy between conservative and radical surgical approaches and frames its purpose for a clinical audience (lines 54–66).

Methodology (Lines 67–83)

- The integrative literature review methodology is clearly described, including databases and search descriptors (lines 67–76).
- Inclusion and exclusion criteria are present but could be improved with more details (e.g., specific study screening and selection protocol).
- There is a minor inconsistency in the number of studies included ("36 articles" in the abstract, "39" in the methodology). This should be clarified (lines 11 and 82).

Disease Characteristics and Diagnosis (Lines 85–139)

- The manuscript presents a rigorous overview of the types and clinical behaviour of ameloblastoma and summary of diagnostic strategies (lines 86–138).
- The discussion of radiological and histopathological diagnosis is clear, yet the section could benefit from additional comparative tabular data or figures illustrating imaging findings.

Surgical Approaches (Lines 140–275)

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- Both conservative and radical surgical techniques are discussed thoroughly (lines 141–195).
- Details on technical procedures for bone grafting and microsurgical options are well presented, demonstrating technical proficiency (lines 196–251).
- Subheadings and visual diagrams could further clarify dense technical narrative.
- The review would be strengthened by more tables or synthesis comparing outcomes (success and recurrence rates) of different approaches.

Rehabilitation and Prosthetic Options (Lines 276–363)

- Functional and aesthetic rehabilitation via prosthetics and osseointegrated implants is robustly explained (lines 277–308).
- New technologies—including CAD/CAM and 3D printing—are highlighted and reflect current clinical innovation (lines 279–289).
- The inclusion of stem cell therapy and BMPs shows awareness of emerging directions, but the manuscript could benefit from more explicit outcomes or long-term data (lines 310–325).
- Limitations and complications of grafting and prosthetic approaches are candidly discussed, including surgical morbidity and technical difficulties (lines 336–363).

Functional/Aesthetic Outcomes and Quality of Life (Lines 364–409)

- The impact of reconstruction on mastication, swallowing, speech, and facial aesthetics is presented thoughtfully (lines 377–395).
- Quality of life considerations and the need for psychological support following extensive procedures are appropriately raised; further detail could be provided with standardized patient-reported outcomes (lines 401–409).

Future Perspectives (Lines 410–425)

- The discussion on advances such as molecular-targeted therapies (e.g., BRAF mutation) and adjuvant modalities (laser and photodynamic therapy) is comprehensive.
- These approaches are clearly marked as experimental, with an appropriate call for further clinical studies.

Conclusion (Lines 427–436)

- The conclusion is succinct, rightly stressing the importance of individualized patient care, technological advances, and detailed surgical planning (lines 427–436).
- It would be improved by precise clinical guidelines and a clear research agenda.

Major Strengths

- Thorough review of both traditional and innovative surgical approaches.
- Well-developed explanations of rehabilitation and quality of life concerns.
- Clear discussion of complications and limitations of current techniques.
- Forward-looking treatment perspectives with awareness of ongoing developments.

Major Weaknesses and Suggested Improvements

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- Clarify the actual number of included studies (lines 11, 82).
- Add summary tables, diagrams, or clinical algorithms for easier comparison of results.
- Enhance detail on long-term rehabilitation and patient outcomes.
- Improve formatting via more frequent use of subheadings and charts for readability.
- Provide standardized definitions and outcome measures, especially regarding functional and aesthetic success.

Reviewer Recommendations

- Ensure consistency in study counts and methodology presentation.
- Include more data visualization (tables, figures) summarizing recurrence and quality of life outcomes.
- Expand the quality-of-life section, with detailed patient experiences and functional outcomes.
- Make use of tabulated comparative results for surgical procedures.
- Standardize formatting across all sections to improve professional readability.

This review aims to guide authors and journal editors through the strengths and areas for improvement in this comprehensive synthesis of ameloblastoma management, with all comments referenced by line numbers for immediate feedback and manuscript revision.