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Reviewer's report:

The authors present a retrospective Evaluation of various pedicled flaps after Ablation of buccal soft tissue including the oral commisure. The paper lauds the advancements of pedicled flaps in times of often excessive use of microvascular flaps and illuminates results in a difficult facial region. Although the aim of the paper is worthy to be published, some rather important Points must be adressed.

1. The paper shows distinct linguistic flaws and should be revised by a native english-speaking lector.

2. The authors should include an evaluation of surgical complications such as flap loss or partial flap necrosis. They state that complication rate was low, but as long as "low" is not objectively categorized, this Information is worthless.

3. The esthetic results (as shown by some photographs) were mostly categorized as "2 - satisfactory". In the light of the shown cases, the judgement of "satisfactory results" might be a rather subjective assessment. How were the esthetic results judged? Who made the judgements? The Patient? The surgeon? Both? The same applies to the functional results.

4. The Discussion section is rather a repetition of the results but does not make any statements regarding the strengths and weaknesses of the study. Literature regarding the topic is rather dealt with in the introduction-section of the manuscript.

5. Generalizability of the conclusions is limited regarding a number of 35 included examinees. The authors should possibly think about creating the paper in style of a comprehensive Review of the literature along with a case series regarding their own surgical results.
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