Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases
Manuscript NO: 86212
Title: Effectiveness of out-fracture of the inferior turbinate with reduction nasal bone fracture

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed
Peer-review model: Single blind
Reviewer’s code: 04427657
Position: Editorial Board
Academic degree: MD
Professional title: Chief Physician, Professor
Reviewer’s Country/Territory: China
Author’s Country/Territory: South Korea
Manuscript submission date: 2023-06-06
Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu
Reviewer accepted review: 2023-07-08 07:28
Reviewer performed review: 2023-07-08 08:13
Review time: 1 Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific quality</th>
<th>[ ] Grade A: Excellent</th>
<th>[ ] Grade B: Very good</th>
<th>[ ] Grade C: Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ] Grade D: Fair</td>
<td>[ ] Grade E: Do not publish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novelty of this manuscript</th>
<th>[ ] Grade A: Excellent</th>
<th>[ ] Grade B: Good</th>
<th>[ ] Grade C: Fair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ] Grade D: No novelty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creativity or innovation of this manuscript</th>
<th>[ ] Grade A: Excellent</th>
<th>[ ] Grade B: Good</th>
<th>[ ] Grade C: Fair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The study aimed to evaluate the severity of nasal obstruction and its improvement after nasal bone fracture reduction with inferior turbinoplasty. And the authors conclude that outfracture of the inferior turbinate is an effective and durable technique, which can be performed easily to enlarge the nasal airway with minimal morbidity. The study had some clinical significances. However, I have some comments. 1. There were some grammatical and syntactic mistakes in the manuscript. For example, page 18, line 10, the sentence “After 4 weeks, all patients were satisfaction.” was not appropriate. 2. Please provided typical nasal endoscopic images of patients if possible. 3. The evaluation of nasal symptoms was visual analogue scale (VAS)? Please gave a concise explanation. 4. Please gave an explanation of the Stranc classification system. 5. Characteristics of all patients should be presented as a Table. 6. Why was the follow-up duration not 12 weeks?
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Specific Comments to Authors

Nasal fracture is a common disease. However, there are few studies on its nasal ventilation. The authors reported an interesting study and provided some evidences. The results showed that turbinoplasty is more helpful to prove nasal obstruction. I appreciate the author's efforts. I believe this article can provide some new and useful information to the readers. So, acceptance should be recommended for this manuscript.
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The paper has been greatly improved. I have no additional comments.