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Reviewer's report:

General

-----------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1) I feel the article lacks detail regarding treatment in each of the cases presented. What compels me to read an article is whether new, innovative, or interesting methods were employed to obtain a superior outcome, or new and emerging technologies were used in diagnosis or treatment. For example:

- There is no mention of the extent of wound debridement (were any antibiotic irrigants used)
- What type of sutures and techniques (Vicryl, gut, etc...; interrupted, running subcuticular, etc...) were used for closure and what was used for obtaining hemostasis intraoperatively
- What imaging studies were used to assess the degree of foreign body contamination, facial fractures, etc...
- What was the post-operative wound care regimen? Were post-operative antibiotics used (Type, dosage, and duration)
- Case 2 fails to show the patient with a healed wound.
- Was there anything done differently than traditional closure techniques and fracture management that provided for a better outcome?

-----------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

-----------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

-----------------------------------------------

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

-----------------------------------------------
Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Acceptable