

## Peer Review File

**Article information:** <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/fomm-22-63>

### Reviewer A

Comment- Authors should discuss role in association with neurosurgical intervention PMID: 35873848 and CSF leak PMID: 35526511

Reply- Thank you for your comment. The change is made. Pg no1. Line no- 42-43.

### Reviewer B

1. Comment In the title, please clearly identify this manuscript as a narrative review (not just brief review) .

Reply-Thank you for the suggestion.The change has been made in the title Pg no1/line no.1

2. Comment The authors should provide a detailed information how the review may potentially impact future researches, clinical practice and policy making in the Abstract-Conclusions

Reply-Thank you for the suggestion. The conclusion is modified accordingly Pg no 1/ Line no 21-23

3. Comment A statement like “Mid-facial fractures are a significant health concern due to frequent vehicle accidents that result in damage to the oral and maxillofacial regions” also should be specified in the Introduction. Otherwise, the long description about vehicle accidents would be confusing.

Reply- Thank you for the suggestion. The change has been made in the introduction Pg no 1/ Line no 29-30

4. Comment The authors also should identify what EXISTING REVIEWS have shared and what gap existing reviews existed.

Reply- Thank you for the suggestion. The change has been made and with references a comment has been added before the purpose of this study Pg no 2/ Line no 45-46

5. Comment “The purpose of this systematic review is to...” should be revised to “The purpose of this literature review is to...”.

Reply- Thank you for the suggestion. The change has been made Pg no 2/ Line no 46

6. Comment Causative factors

1) Para 1: In the sentence “As a result of these variations in causal factors...”, what are these variations? And I failed to know what the causal factors are.

Reply- Thank you for your keen observation. It was a spelling mistake which has been corrected Pg no 2/ Line no 73

7. Comment Para 1: The authors should cite more references for the sentence “A number of research have been conducted...” to consistent with “A number of research”. The similar problem needs to be solved in the next sentence “The majority of research conducted...”.

Reply- Thank you for precise suggestion. The changes have been made accordingly Pg no 2/ Line no 74-77

8. Comment What is the source of the data in Figure 1 ? And the more stand-alone footnotes should be provided for Figure 1. We would suggest the authors consider specifying the data in words in the text and deleting the Figure 1.

Reply- The study conducted in Pondicherry India, reference number 18 is basis of the figure 1. But the figure is deleted as per reviewer's suggestion --

9. Comment According to the reference 22, diffusion-weighted imaging can help in many such situations by providing additional information, including help in differentiating benign from malignant lesions. The authors should consider the statement "diffusion-weighted imaging (DWI) have not contributed additional utility for such trauma".

Reply- Thank you for pointing this out. The sentence has been modified Pg no 3/ Line no 108-109

10. Comment Classification systems

1) Some words are misspelled, please check: "categorised" should be "categorized"; "summarising" should be "summarizing". Please check the spelling problems in the full-text

Reply-Thank you for the suggestion. The spellings have been corrected Pg no 3/ Line no 122,134,158

11. Comment Para 3: "where Type 1 fractures are similar to Le Fort II but do not involve the nasal skeleton, Type II fractures are similar to Le Fort II, Type III fractures are similar to Le Fort III but do not involve the nasal skeleton, and Type IV fractures are identical to Le Fort III". This sentence is confusing, suggest to reorganize it to facilitate the reader its meaning.

Reply- The classification is describe Pg no 4/ Line no 138-140

12. Comment Because the fractures are graded from I to IV, whether the classification system in Table 1 should be "Wassmund classification system" not "Le Fort classification system"? Similar to the point on Figure 1, please also add more stand-alone footnotes for Table 1.

Reply-Thank for suggesting , a modification is added Table1

13. Comment Para 4: In the statement of "Audige classification", the information about "Level 1" seems not to be provided.

Reply- Thank for pointing out, the correction is made Pg no 4/ Line no 168

14. Comment Para 4: "1Thus, Dreizin et al. introduced a new classification...". The number "1" should be deleted.

Reply-Thank for pointing out, the correction is made Pg no 4/ Line no 173

15. Comment I failed to find the Figure 4 in the manuscript.

Reply- Rightly said thank you. The sentence is deleted -

16. Comment A separate paragraph on strengths and limitations of the review should be provided in the main body to promote a more intellectual interpretation

Reply- Thank for suggesting . the necessary change is madePg no 6/ Line no 235-237

Further suggestions

1. Comment Narrative Review Checklist to be added  
Reply- Yes it is added
  
2. Comment-Due to the recently updated Author Instruction (<https://cdn.amegroups.cn/static/public/2.2.3-Structure%20of%20Narrative%20Reviews-template-V2022.11.4.docx> ), please kindly organize the structure of the manuscript  
Reply-The manuscript is arranged accordingly
  
3. Comment- Please re-adjust the structure of the Abstract: Structured with Background and Objective (describe relevant background, reasons for conducting this review and primary objectives of this review), Methods (briefly describe the search strategy, including databases, time frame, and language considerations), Key Content and Findings (describe what the literature review will mainly contain and any key findings), and Conclusions (describe the main conclusions and how the review may potentially impact future researches, clinical practice and policy making)  
Reply- Abstract is readjusted Pg no 1/ Line no 2-23
  
4. Comment- A separate background, rationale and knowledge gap, and objective section needed to be embedded in the Introduction.  
Reply- Thank for suggesting . This is added Pg no 2/ Line no 44-46
  
5. Comment- A separate paragraph of "Methods" should be provided in the main text. Specify the process for identifying the literature search (eg, years considered, language, publication status, study design, and databases of coverage) in the subsection.  
Reply- Thank for suggesting . This is added Pg no 3/ Line no 112=115