

**Peer Review File**

**Article information:** <http://dx.doi.org/10.21037/fomm-20-50>

**Reviewer A**

# Major Point

This study is interesting study for understanding mouth opening range of Albanian population, however there are some problems.

1) What is the novelty of this study? Is this first report of range of mouth opening of Albanian population?

**Answer:** The novelty of this study is the fact that is the first report of normal average value of MMO in Albanian population.

2) Authors should do statistical analysis for comparing mouth opening according to aging.

**Answer:** Your suggestion has been addressed and the statistical analysis was performed.

3) In both results and discussion, information is too less to understand this study correctly.

**Answer:** Your suggestion has been addressed and discussion has been reorganized.

# Minor Point

1) Diagram nr.2: There was no number of 31-40 years.

2) Diagram nr.2 is better to be include to Table nr. 2 for simplify.

**Both minor points have been addressed and corrected.**

**Reviewer B**

Line 13: "TMJs" If you are using for the first time please write in full and put in bracket the abbreviation unless there is a section dedicated to meaning of abbreviations

Line 22: 20- 78 years should be changed to 20 – 78 years

Line 22: 43,6 mm should be changed to 43.5 mm

Line 23: 40,8 mm should be changed to 40.8 mm

Line 23: "At both" should be changed to "In both"

Line 35 – 37: "The patterns of movement are the best and the simplest indicator if this correlation between anatomical integrity and functionality requirements are harmonious or not" to read "For the TMJ, patterns of movement are the best and the simplest indicator that shows whether this correlation between anatomical integrity and functionality requirements are harmonious or not"

Line 37: "became" to read "becomes"

Line 38: "clue" to read "tool"

Paragraph between line 39 and 43 needs to be rephrased. It says a variety of techniques have been developed like “millimeter rule, a millimeter caliper.....”. Note that these are instruments and not techniques. For instance there are different techniques of measuring maximum mouth opening and different instruments have been utilized for the measurements, it is not clear what the authors are referring to here.

Line 45 to 46: Is the value of 53–58 mm quoted here referring to mean maximum mouth opening or range of mouth opening? The normal range of mouth opening quoted here does not appear to capture a universal research result. Apart from the fact that the study quoted here is very old, there are so many factors that affect the range of mouth opening and the one that the researcher should put here should be the one that captures the range from different ethnic groups, gender, age etc. This can only be a reflection of how well the researcher has researched the literature on this topic. There should be more than one study to be referenced here except if the study being referenced is a review of different studies. I also assume the reason for embarking on this research stems from the fact that maximum mouth opening has racial, ethnic, geographical etc. variations, and it is to find out what the range is among their own populace.

Line 47-48: A cut off of 40 mm for diagnosis of restricted mouth opening appears high for most studies that have been documented, including recent studies. Advisable that the authors do a good review of the literature on this topic especially more recent studies.

Line 60 to 70: This is not a review study I do not think the table is necessary here and should be deleted. The main message in this area can easily be captured as; Previously documented literature has shown maximal mouth opening to have ethnic, racial and gender variations (references). No previous study has been done to characterize the normal range of mouth opening among the Albanians. The aim of the study was to estimate the average maximum mouth opening and range of mouth opening in a representative sample of individuals in Albania population.

Under materials and methods:

What is the study design?

Was ethical approval obtained for this study? This should be stated

Was informed consent obtained from the patients? This should be stated

What is the study population where the study participants (those that met the inclusion criteria) were eventually selected from?

The study period should be stated

Was any form of sampling technique employed?

How was the sampling done to ensure proper representation of Albanian population?

It should be more explicit who the study population are

How was the data collected?

How was the data analyzed?

Was any form of statistical analysis performed?

During measurement of interincisal distance, was it only one reading that was taken? Most techniques of measurement of interincisal distance documented in the literature are in support of

taking more than one measurement from a patient and then using the average or the highest reading. This tends to give a more realistic reading than just a single measurement.

Results:

Line 115: what is 'nr'?

Line 115: Table 2 has no caption or title?

Line 124: "Diagram nr. 1" not clear and I think it should be written as "Figure 1"

Line 127: "Diagram nr. 2" to be written as "Figure 2"

Line 131 to 133: "Diagram nr. 3" to be written as "Figure 3". What is written as caption or title here is explanatory note and a proper title or caption should be written.

No form of statistical analysis was done in the study, this does not allow for proper and critical assessment of variables. For instance difference in maximal mouth opening between gender, to know whether it is statistically significant, needs a form of statistical analysis, ditto for age etc.

The researcher mentioned in the introductory aspect that several factors may affect maximal mouth opening, it would have been nice to also look at the effect of some of these factors (which may be possible confounders), will help to bring out the true picture. Without these, it may be difficult to actually compare the findings with findings from other climes.

Where the words Diagram nr appears should be replaced with Fig.

Discussion:

The discussion section here is quite shallow

Most parts of the discussion in this manuscript appear to me as more or less a repetition of the results.

Ideally, the most important finding should be summarized at the beginning of discussion.

You should look at the major results and then: 1) Describe the patterns, principles, relationships your results show. 2) Explain how your results relate to expectations and to previous findings in the literature, do they agree, contradict or are they exceptions to the rule? 3) Explain plausibly any agreement, contradictions or exceptions. 4) Suggest the theoretical implications of your results.

Will be nice to discuss different aspects independently and compare with previous findings. E.g. gender and mouth opening, age and mouth opening.

Ideally after reading this kind of manuscript one should be able to quote the values of mouth openings for Albanians (including the variations with gender and age), but this cannot be said of this study from the discussion, and doesn't appear to have addressed the objectives.

The researcher mentioned in passing, the techniques of measuring mouth opening, this should also be part of discussion since it's been documented as a possible reason for variations in results.

Line 149: Discussion:

Line 151: The author mentioned "direct" method of measurement, what is this "direct" method?. This was not mentioned anywhere in the manuscript, is there "indirect" method?

Line 151 to 152: The authors claimed that direct method has proved to be accurate? There is no part of this research that points to this assertion. The researchers did not carry out any analysis to check for accuracy, so this cannot be scientifically claimed here and is misleading.

Line 154: I do not know what this statement "The results of this test can help the dentist to refer

the patient on the specialist” is trying to pass across vis a vis the outcome of this study?

Line 155 to 156: I actually feel if the researchers reviewed the literature well it will be obvious that most previous studies actually included other variables like race, gender and ethnicity and would have been nice to be part of their research.

References:

Majority of the references are quite old.

Overall Comment:

Although a fair attempt at research and publication of clinical work, which is commendable, however, for the manuscript to merit any consideration especially in a journal of international repute, it needs to be totally revised.

Answers: All your suggestions were addressed and corrected on the revised manuscript.

Thank you very much for your time and considerations.