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REVIEWER COMMENTS FROM REPORT: I thank the authors for submitting this interesting manuscript.

The authors investigated the clinical differences between the extraoral and intraoral approaches in the surgical treatment of subcondylar fractures from the patient's point of view and objectively discussed the pros and cons of both methods.

The study design is clear, concise and well structured, the methodology is clearly described and executed and the results are discussed objectively with plenty of older and more recent references on this topic.

When reading the manuscript, the reader will not only concisely understand the study, its results and discussion, but might also learn the surgical protocol for both surgical approaches.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

The authors rightfully cited their previous publication [19] on this topic but might have still added some figures for the most "crucial" steps in both surgical procedures also in this manuscript to prevent the reader from needing to search for and look up the authors' previous publication. Please add some figures depicting the surgical procedure if the journal provides no restrictions on the number of figures.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

Only a few English grammar, syntax and wording issues arose in the discussions section of the presented manuscript. (P 13, Line 51-54, P 14, Line 14-25). Please revise.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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