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Dear Editor of Head & Face Medicine journal;

Regarding the reviewing process of the manuscript titled “Porous High-Density Polyethylene in Facial Reconstruction and Revision Rhinoplasty: A Cross Sectional Study”, I have read the manuscript. I must note that this manuscript needs some corrections and there are some questions which must be answered. These comments and queries are as follows:

# INTRODUCTION
1. At the end of “Introduction” section, the authors should clearly state their aims and objectives. Having mentioned that “…we report our experience of using Medpor® in some aspects of facial reconstruction …” is not a clear and exact statement.

# METHODS
2. According to what is mentioned in the section “Ethical Approval”, it seems that the study is performed prospectively and study setting and data are gathered in different time points. Conclusively, it seems that this study is not a so-called cross-sectional research but a historical or even prospective cohort study.
3. The outcomes measured in this study after surgeries is not mentioned in the “Methods” section. Please give more information on measured variables, follow-up time and methods for follow-up assessment.

# RESULTS
4. Please provide some demographic and baseline data on your enrolled patients.
5. How much was the mean follow-up time in your study?
6. How did the authors evaluate patients’ satisfaction after reconstruction surgeries?

# DISCUSSION
7. In spite of giving some redundant historical information at the beginning of “Discussion” section, it is better to start with a brief report of main findings.
8. The “Discussion” section significantly lacks a logical comparison between
findings of other studies with that of the authors.

9. Study limitation should be mentioned before the final conclusion.

10. It is not possible to conclude such generalized recommendations without any statistical interpretation in such a limited case series.

In my opinion, the manuscript needs major compulsory revision to be considered for further evaluation.

Seyed-Mohammad Fereshtehnejad MD. MPH.
Department of Neurobiology, Care Sciences & Society (NVS), Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.

**Declaration of competing interests:**

I declare that I have no competing interests.