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Reviewer's report:

General
This is a very well written paper however I have concerns regarding the methodology and significance.

The paper reports on the results of a questionnaire given to “specialists” who attended the Pan African Congress on Cleft Lip and Palate. This information is gleaned from the Abstract and should be also given in the Methods section. However, it is highly dubious that this type of sampling can produce a representative sample of “specialists” in Nigeria due to the inherent selection bias. The sample is also quite inhomogenous, given that it includes speech pathologists, dentists, pediatricians, and anesthesiologists along with surgeons. There is no information in the results regarding the volume of cleft lip and palate surgery performed by each of respondents or by there hospitals, thus it is possible some of the respondents perform a very low volume of cleft surgery.

Unfortunately, the methodology of the study greatly weakens the significance of the results.

As the authors noted, team approach to cleft lip and palate is the norm in Europe and North America. Thus, while the results of the present study may be of interest to an African readership, they are probably of little interest to a global readership.
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What next?: Reject as not sufficiently sound
Level of interest: Reject as not of sufficient priority to merit publishing in this journal

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.