### **Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRS_95874
Title of the Manuscript:	Surgical treatment of keloids in the ear: prospective and randomized study comparing direct surgical excision vs. Keloid Fillet Flap
Type of the Article	prospective and randomized study

#### **General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(https://www.journalajrs.com/index.php/AJRS/editorial-policy)

### **PART 1:** Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The manuscript contains important informations for the scientific community,  This is a prospective randomized study of a single center with patients with keloids in	
1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?	the auricular area. The primary mechanism for keloid generation is the increased	
(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	synthesis or smaller reabsorption of collagen caused by a relative decrease in collagen	
	production or direct inhibition of such an enzyme. There is a great variety of treatments,	
2. Is the title of the article suitable?	no monotherapy is adequate, and the best therapy is still prevention.	
(If not please suggest an alternative title)	The participant patients of the study were randomly divided into two groups: direct	
	surgical excision-RC (n = 36 patients); and the group Keloid Fillet Flap-KFF (n = 37	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	patients). In both groups, neoadjuvant treatment of infiltration with triamcinolone 20	
	mg/ml until the end of the clinical activity of the keloid was performed. The treatments	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	followed the adjuvant treatment of 10 sessions of Beta Ray Therapy.	
	Following the use of the scar measuring scales to define the recurrence rate, the	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	study demonstrated a recurrence rate of the total sample of 62%, with the KFF group	
	presenting a rate of 76% and the RC group presenting a rate of 40%. Wounds with	
6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have	volumes greater than 50 cm³ have high recurrence rates. The study also showed that	
suggestion of additional references, please mention in the	the average wound volumes that were not recurrent in the RC group were 1,6 cm <sup>3</sup> , and	
review form.	in the KFF group, 13 cm <sup>3</sup> , and this difference was statistically significant.	
(Anart from above mentioned 6 nainte reviewers are free to provide	The shatrest of the article is comprehensive	
(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide	The abstract of the article is comprehensive.	
additional suggestions/comments)	Subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The manuscript scientifically correct.	
	The references are sufficient and recent.	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes	
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly		
communications?		
Optional/General comments	page 12:	
	A systematic review, comparing the use of radiotherapy and corticosteroid infiltration adjuvant to excision of ear keloids, published by Shin <i>et al.</i> on September 23, showed	
	adjuvant to excision of ear kelolus, published by Shift et al. on ochtember , Showed	1

## PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's comment</b> (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Created by: DR Checked by: PM Approved by: MBM Version: 1.7 (15-12-2022)

## **Review Form 1.7**

# **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	János Hunyady
Department, University & Country	University of Debrecen, Hungary

Created by: DR Checked by: PM Approved by: MBM Version: 1.7 (15-12-2022)