

Nasal prosthesis with magnetically secured intranasal framework for a patient with partial rhinectomy and intra-oral defects: a case report

Anjana Kurien, Megashyam Poundass, Subha Anirudhan, Thirumurthy Ramasamy
Velliangattur, Bindhoo Arakonam Yuvaraja, Arun Masilamani

Corresponding author
Anjana Kurien

Department of Prosthodontics, Sri Ramakrishna Dental College and Hospital, Coimbatore

Handling editor:
Michal Heger

Department of Pharmaceutics, Utrecht University, the Netherlands

Department of Pharmaceutics, Jiaying University Medical College, Zhejiang, China

Review timeline:

Received: 18 March, 2020
Editorial decision: 19 April, 2020
Revision received: 15 May, 2020
Editorial decision: 6 July, 2020
Revision received: 30 July, 2020
Editorial decision: 15 August, 2020
Revision received: 12 September, 2020
Editorial decision: 23 September, 2020
Published online: 14 October, 2020

1st editorial decision
19-Apr-2020

Ref.: Ms. No. JCTRes-D-20-00016

NASAL PROSTHESIS FOR A PATIENT USING A CUSTOMIZED INTRANASAL FRAME WORK AND MAGNETS - A CASE REPORT

Journal of Clinical and Translational Research

Dear Dr Kurien,

Reviewers have now commented on your paper, which has yielded an "accept," a "major revision," and a "reject" verdict. You will see that they are advising that you revise your manuscript, and the editorial board has chosen to grant you the opportunity to significantly improve your manuscript in accordance with their advice. If you are prepared to undertake the work required, I would be pleased to reconsider my decision.

For your guidance, reviewers' comments are appended below. The editorial board is kindly asking you to take the comments of reviewer 2 very seriously and implement the requested modifications to the maximum possible extent.

If you decide to revise the work, please submit a list of changes or a rebuttal against each point which is being raised when you submit the revised manuscript. Also, please ensure that the track changes function is switched on when implementing the revisions. This enables the reviewers to rapidly verify all changes made.

Your revision is due by May 19, 2020.

To submit a revision, go to <https://www.editorialmanager.com/jctres/> and log in as an Author. You will see a menu item call Submission Needing Revision. You will find your submission record there.

Yours sincerely

Michal Heger
Editor-in-Chief
Journal of Clinical and Translational Research

Reviewers' comments:

Reviewer #1: This case report is very interesting. But your references are not up to date. The authors may wish to evaluate the findings of a more recent, about the maxillofacial prostheses: DOI: 10.4103/njcp.njcp_92_19.

There are some typos : page 4 line 25 (wasgeneralized), line 31 (weplanned), line 55 (twoneodymium), page 6 line 56 (restorethe),page 7 line 56 (tothe), page 8 line 18 (canbe), and page 5 line 60(MAARC hard modelling wax, Shiva Products, Maharashtra, India) is no need to rewrite and page 7 line 12 wrong reference (Only you refer rogers and et al. delete 12)

Reviewer #2: You described a technique using magnets to rehabilitate a patient with a midfacial defect. A custom made framework and magnets to retain a nose prosthesis on a dental prosthesis has been used.

Although you presented a nice case report there are some major issues of concern;

- The introduction is of poor quality. In the first part of the introduction more references should be provided. Next some false information is given; it is stated that the percentage of success of implants in irradiated tissues is minimal. This is not in line with papers from other authors like Korfage A et al 2016
- In the introduction no clear overview of the current problems and knowledge is given. What is so special in this case? Why should it be printed in a journal, what is the additional value of this paper when compared to all other paper printed previously? It is clear to me as a reader.
- In the clinical report the number of teeth are mentioned. It is unclear why they mention the lower teeth. Also it looks like the prosthesis showed in figure 4 will not fit in the mouth that is presented in figure 2.
- In the clinical report no information on the health of teeth is given.
- In the clinical report it is stated; The framework was designed to fulfill three criteria. 1) To form a framework for the missing nasal septum, 2) To provide a base for the nose and a platform for positioning the magnets, and 3) To provide a lateral border for the nasal prosthesis. But it can be questioned why the authors do state this. Why should one want a frame for the missing septum? In prosthetics the nasal septum is never used for retention or stabilization. In my opinion the only reason for fabricating a framework is the give strength to the nasal prosthesis and the magnets, however in this case I doubt if this is really necessary

from a technical point of view as magnets do attach very well to the silicone with the right adhesives and the silicone are strong enough to hold the shape.

- In the clinical report the name of the company is pronounced wrong. It is Technovent and not Technodent.
- In the discussion it is stated; Implants which are osseo-integrated, provide the most reliable retention for these prostheses. However there are no references given. Neither is explained where the implants in this case should have been placed.
- In the discussion it is not discussed why 3D technology is not used. Nowadays it is normal to use 3D technology to get better shape, fit and color.
- In the discussion the authors state: The functional life span of a silicone nasal prosthesis is on an average has been reported to be for 12 months. However this is not in line with others like Visser a et al (2008). It is not discussed and no references are given.
- In the figures I miss a figure that shows the prosthesis with magnets in place.

Reviewer #3: The facial rehabilitation is a very important instrument for the restored life quality of the mutilated patient. This is the importance of this paper.

There is additional documentation related to this decision letter. To access the file(s), please click the link below. You may also login to the system and click the 'View Attachments' link in the Action column.

Authors' response

Reviewer	Comment	Response	Pg number and line
1	The authors may wish to evaluate the findings of a more recent, about the maxillofacial prostheses: DOI: 10.4103/njcp.njcp_92_19.	Recent findings included.	Page number: 8 Line number : 10-16
	There are some typos : 1. page 4 line 25 (wasgeneralized), 2. line 31 (weplanned), 3. line 55 (twoneodymium), 4. page 6 line 56 (restorethe), 5. page 7 line 56 (tothe), 6. page 8 line 18 (canbe), and 7. page 5 line 60(MAARC hard modelling wax, Shiva Products, Maharashtra, India) is no need to rewrite 8.page 7 line 12 wrong reference (Only you refer rogers and et al. delete 12)	Typos corrected	1,2,5 - deleted 3. Page number : 5 Line number : 11 4. Page number : 8 Line number : 4 6. Page number : 9 Line number : 27-28 7. Page number : 6 Line number : 8 8. Page number : 8 Line number : 18-19

2	<p>- The introduction is of poor quality. In the first part of the introduction more references should be provided. Next some false information is given; it is stated that the percentage of success of implants in irradiated tissues is minimal. This is not in line with papers from other authors like Korfage A et all 2016</p>	<p>The introduction has been rewritten and updated with more references including the reference to Korfage A et all</p>	<p>Page number: 2 Line number: 2 – 30 Page number: 3 Line number: 1-24</p>
	<p>In the introduction no clear overview of the current problems and knowledge is given. What is so special in this case? Why should it be printed in a journal, what is the additional value of this paper when compared to all other paper printed previously? It is clear to me as a reader.</p>	<p>It is a clinical preview.</p>	
	<p>In the clinical report the number of teeth are mentioned. It is unclear why they mention the lower teeth. Also it looks like the prosthesis showed in figure 4 will not fit in the mouth that is presented in figure 2.</p>	<p>The mention of the lower teeth has been removed. Figure 4 shows intra oral picture before second surgery and radiation.</p>	<p>Page number: 4 Line number: 22</p>
	<p>In the clinical report no information on the health of teeth is given</p>	<p>Health of teeth has been added.</p>	<p>Page number:4 Line number: 19</p>

	<p>In the clinical report it is stated; The framework was designed to fulfill three criteria. 1) To form a framework for the missing nasal septum, 2) To provide a base for the nose and a platform for positioning the magnets, and 3) To provide a lateral border for the nasal prosthesis. But it can be questioned why the authors do state this. Why should one want a frame for the missing septum? In prosthetics the nasal septum is never used for retention or stabilization. In my opinion the only reason for fabricating a framework is the give strength to the nasal prosthesis and the magnets, however in this case I doubt if this is really necessary from a technical point of view as magnets do attach very well to the silicone with the right adhesives and the silicone are strong enough to hold the shape.</p>	<p>The line has been rephrased</p>	<p>Page number:6 Line number: 19-21</p>
	<p>- In the clinical report the name of the company is pronounced wrong. It is Technovent and not Technodent.</p>	<p>Corrected</p>	<p>Page number: 7 Line number: 1,2</p>
	<p>In the discussion it is stated; Implants which are osseointegrated, provide the most reliable retention for these prostheses. However there are no references given. Neither is explained where the implants in this case should have been placed.</p>	<p>References have been added.</p>	<p>Page number:3 Line number : 1-2</p>
	<p>In the discussion it is not discussed why 3D technology is not used. Nowadays it is normal to use 3D technology to get better shape, fit and color.</p>	<p>Information on the same has been added.</p>	<p>Page number: 8 Line number : 24-27</p>
	<p>In the discussion the authors state: The functional life span of a silicone nasal prosthesis is on an average has been reported to be for 12 months. However this is not</p>	<p>The data has been updated with references added.</p>	<p>Page number: 10 Line number : 12-13</p>

	in line with others like Visser a et al (2008). It is not discussed and no references are given.		
	In the figures I miss a figure that shows the prosthesis with magnets in place.	Figure 4 and figure 14 show magnets in place	Page number:15,18
3	I The facial rehabilitation is a very important instrument for the restored life quality of the mutilated patient. This is the importance of this paper.		

2nd Editorial decision
06-Jul-2020

Ref.: Ms. No. JCTRes-D-20-00016R1
NASAL PROSTHESIS FOR A PATIENT USING A CUSTOMIZED INTRANASAL
FRAME WORK AND MAGNETS - A CASE REPORT
Journal of Clinical and Translational Research

Dear Dr Kurien,

Reviewers have now commented on your paper. You will see that they are advising that you revise your manuscript again. If you are prepared to undertake the work required, I would be pleased to reconsider my decision.

For your guidance, reviewers' comments are appended below. Please pay particular attention to reviewer 2, who is an expert in the field. Not taking the reviewer's previous comments into account in your revision is unacceptable in the absence of a proper rebuttal. Also, JCTR cannot publish poorly written manuscripts. We therefore recommend that you engage a native speaker to correct the numerous linguistic mistakes or contact our editorial desk for support.

If you decide to revise the work, please submit a list of changes or a rebuttal against each point which is being raised when you submit the revised manuscript. Also, please ensure that the track changes function is switched on when implementing the revisions. This enables the reviewers to rapidly verify all changes made.

Your revision is due by Aug 05, 2020.

To submit a revision, go to <https://www.editorialmanager.com/jctres/> and log in as an Author. You will see a menu item call Submission Needing Revision. You will find your submission record there.

Yours sincerely

Michal Heger

Editor-in-Chief
Journal of Clinical and Translational Research

Reviewers' comments:

Reviewer #1: The subject and writing method were suitable for the journal. The subject was interesting. The study is acceptable to me.

Reviewer #2: most of my previous concerns are not adequately addressed.

There are still several other concerns; I mention some of them here;

Abstract;

"A technique using magnets;"

This gives the impression that the paper it is all about magnets but it is all not about magnets, it is about a nasal prosthesis retained by a frame that contains magnets.

The authors claim this to be a viable alternative to implants but implants are impossible in this case.

And in case the patient would not have a defect in the premaxilla this solution was not optional. This is not very well addressed in the paper.

The authors mention collormatching as challenging in the abstract while they do not mention this in the introduction. I wonder why they mention this as this paper is not about collormatching but about retention of a facial prosthesis with the aid of magnets. An abstract is an abstract. It should only contain information that is described in the paper

The whole abstract is not very clear written leaving the reader with unanswered questions.

The authors describe magnets as cost effective however good magnets are very expensive.

Introduction;

""It is preferred to place the implant on the floor of the nose...."

Implants to retain a nasal prosthesis are supposed to be placed in the floor of the nose and not on the floor. And commonly 2 implants instead of 1 should be used.

In The text there are stil several of typos ; for example

* An implant retained nasal prosthesis instead of implants retained.

"Magnets are a viable alternative to implants. "

In my opinion each situation is different. One can not state that magnets are a viable alternative to implants as firstly magnets alone are useless. Magnets are only viable if they are placed in a frame construction. But it is not always possible to make a frame, eg in cases with small defects. And a frame is not always comfortable.

In the case as described here, implants are not possible. So the magnet retained nasal prosthesis is the only option, it is not an alternative. I doubt if the authors are very experienced.

In this introduction some things are mentioned that can be skipped and other things are missing.

At the end the obturator is mentioned, however it comes out of nothing. The obturator should

have been described earlier in the introduction.

Discussion:

Page 11 line 27/28

The author compares an obturator with a silicone facial prosthesis. Both are made out of different materials (pmma acrylic versus silicone) and can not be compared.

Please pay attention to the reference list..... there are many things not correctly written

Authors' response

Reviewer	Comment	Response	Pg number and line
1	The subject and writing method were suitable for the journal. The subject was interesting. The study is acceptable to me.	Thank you for your review	
2	Thank you for your kind perusal and subsequent review. We have corrected the article as per your suggestions and I hope that it is satisfactory to you.		
2	There are still several other concerns; I mention some of them here; Abstract; "A technique using magnets;" This gives the impression that the paper it is all about magnets but it is all not about magnets, it is about a nasal prosthesis retained by a frame that contains magnets.	Abstract has been corrected	Page number: 1 Line number: 4-16 Kindly note all changes are in blue
	The authors claim this to be a viable alternative to implants but implants are impossible in this case. And in case the patient would not have a defect in the premaxilla this solution was not optional. This is not very well addressed in the paper.	This has been changed	Page number: 3 Line number: 20-23

	<p>The authors mention color matching as challenging in the abstract while they do not mention this in the introduction. I wonder why they mention this as this paper is not about color matching but about retention of a facial prosthesis with the aid of magnets. An abstract is an abstract. It should only contain information that is described in the paper</p>	<p>The mention of colour has been removed from abstract</p>	<p>Page number: 1 Line number: 7-8</p>
	<p>The whole abstract is not very clear written leaving the reader with unanswered questions.</p>	<p>Rephrased</p>	<p>Page number:1 Line number: 4-16</p>
	<p>The authors describe magnets as cost effective however good</p>	<p>The line has been rephrased</p>	<p>Page number:3 Line number: 21</p>

	<p>magnets are very expensive.</p>		
	<p>Introduction; ""It is preferred to place the implant on the floor of the nose...." Implants to retain a nasal prosthesis are supposed to be placed in the floor of the nose and not on the floor. And commonly 2 implants instead of 1 should be used.</p>	<p>Corrected</p>	<p>Page number: 3 Line number: 7-8</p>
	<p>In The text there are still several of typos ; for example * An implant retained nasal prosthesis instead of implants retained</p>	<p>Corrected</p>	<p>Page number:3 Line number : 9-10</p>

	<p>"Magnets are a viable alternative to implants. "</p> <p>In my opinion each situation is different. One cannot state that magnets are a viable alternative to implants as firstly magnets alone are useless. Magnets are only viable if they are placed in a frame construction. But it is not always possible to make a frame, eg in cases with small defects. And a frame is not always comfortable. In the case as described here, implants are not possible. So the magnet retained nasal prosthesis is the only option, it is not an alternative. I doubt if the authors are very experienced.</p>	Rephrased	Page number: 3 Line number : 20-23
	<p>In this introduction some things are mentioned that can be skipped and other things are missing. At the end the obturator is mentioned, however it comes out of nothing. The obturator should have been described earlier in the introduction.</p>	Has been mentioned	Page number: 2 Line number : 14-15
	<p>Discussion: Page 11 line 27/28 The author compares an obturator with a silicone facial prosthesis.</p>	Sentence has been rephrased to remove comparison	Page number:10 Line number:1-2
	<p>Both are made out of different materials (pmma acrylic versus silicone) and cannot be compared.</p>		

3rd Editorial decision

15-Aug-2020

Ref.: Ms. No. JCTRes-D-20-00016R2

NASAL PROSTHESIS FOR A PATIENT USING A CUSTOMIZED INTRANASAL
FRAME WORK AND MAGNETS - A CASE REPORT

Journal of Clinical and Translational Research

Dear Dr Kurien,

Reviewers have now commented on your paper. You will see that they are advising that you revise your manuscript. If you are prepared to undertake the work required, I would be pleased to reconsider my decision.

For your guidance, reviewers' comments are appended below.

If you decide to revise the work, please submit a list of changes or a rebuttal against each point which is being raised when you submit the revised manuscript. Also, please ensure that the track changes function is switched on when implementing the revisions. This enables the reviewers to rapidly verify all changes made.

Your revision is due by Sep 14, 2020.

To submit a revision, go to <https://www.editorialmanager.com/jctres/> and log in as an Author. You will see a menu item call Submission Needing Revision. You will find your submission record there.

Yours sincerely

Michal Heger
Editor-in-Chief
Journal of Clinical and Translational Research

Reviewers' comments:

Editor-in-chief: Dear authors, although your paper is deemed to have been improved, there are still major concerns. The reviewer, who is a leading expert in the field, has been so kind to point out specific errors in your manuscript and to provide guidance as to how certain parts of the paper should be written. We have sanitized the PDF containing the reviewer's comments to protect the reviewer's identity and appended the copy to this decision letter. I kindly ask you to put in as much work as the reviewer has done so far. It is unacceptable that your manuscript is resubmitted with such flagrant grammatical and spelling errors. Reviewers should never have to act as spelling correction engines; instead they should focus mainly on substance. Please be conscientious about this in your next resubmission. The editorial board always seeks to appease both authors and reviewers, while never abandoning our mission to only put out high-quality work in all respects. At this stage, we are choosing the reviewer's side because there are no excuses for poorly written manuscripts.

Reviewer #2: The paper has improved however it is still hard to read for an outsider as important issues are not described very well;

- there are many typing errors in the text. Especially the references section is a mess.
- it is still unclear that implants are not optional in this case as there is no bone. It is still suggested that the magnets are an alternative for implants.
- It is still unclear how the prosthesis can fit in the mouth of as presented in fig 2 without extracting teeth. I miss also rontgen information. How can one state that the condition of the elements is oke without an X ray?
- The obturator scale is something described in the discussion but not really in the clinical report section. The OFS comes out of nothing in the clinical report. (parts from the discussion should be in this section and not in the discussion section)

- The introduction needs a lot of improvements. The reader still, gets puzzled. What is the problem, what is known in literature, what is not and what is the aim of the paper. What is new?

There is additional documentation related to this decision letter. To access the file(s), please click the link below. You may also login to the system and click the 'View Attachments' link in the Action column.

Authors' rebuttal

-

4th Editorial decision
23-Sept-2020

Ref.: Ms. No. JCTRes-D-20-00016R3

Nasal prosthesis with magnetically secured intranasal framework for a patient with partial rhinectomy and intra-oral defects: a case report
Journal of Clinical and Translational Research

Dear authors,

I am pleased to inform you that your manuscript has been accepted for publication in the Journal of Clinical and Translational Research.

Please see a note from the editor below.

You will receive the proofs of your article shortly, which we kindly ask you to thoroughly review for any errors.

Thank you for submitting your work to JCTR.

Kindest regards,

Michal Heger
Editor-in-Chief
Journal of Clinical and Translational Research

Comments from the editors and reviewers:

Dear authors, I was still dissatisfied with the modifications you made, so I changed the title, the text, and significantly improved the figures.

You may download everything through this secured link:

<https://filesender.surf.nl/?s=download&token=c5492f47-e542-4a79-8635-dc33df34463d>

It will be valid till October 10th.

Kindest regards,

Journal of Clinical and Translational Research
Peer review process file 06.202005.004

Michal Heger
Editor-in-chief

