

Bony Cartilaginous Unit or Osteochondral Nasal Septal Graft: A Versatile Graft in Rhinoplasty

To the Editor: On May 23, 2024, *The Journal of Craniofacial Surgery* published an article by Assiri et al¹ entitled “Indications, Stability, and Surgical Outcomes of Using Osteochondral Nasal Septal Graft as a Septal Extension Graft in Rhinoplasty Patients: A Prospective Cohort Study.” I read with great interest this article, which explains the use of an osteochondral graft as a caudal septal extension graft (OSEG) in 33 patients with limited amounts of cartilage, comparing their results with 33 patients who received cartilaginous caudal septal extension grafts. The authors noted that only one previous study, by Chou et al² in 2022, had discussed the use of an osteochondral septal graft as a septal extension graft.

I acknowledge the excellence of this study. However, I would like to point out that the aforementioned technique was published in August 2016 by me in an article entitled “The Bony Cartilaginous Unit: The Missing Graft in Septorhinoplasty.”³ This article described harvesting the cartilaginous septum and posterior bony part as an integrated unit to compensate for limited cartilage availability and using it as an OSEG. Furthermore, in a study published in July 2019, the technique was described in detail in 40 revision septorhinoplasty cases.⁴

Fortunately, in response to our letter to the editor, Chou and colleagues acknowledged that the technique had been previously described.^{5,6} In addition, the surgical methods described in the article by Assiri and colleagues were the same as those we introduced previously, without referencing our publications. Moreover, the page number they referred to for work by Chou and colleagues is incorrect (page 312), as it actually pertains to our article published in *Facial Plastic Surgery and Esthetic Medicine*.^{2,5}

I believe that the osteochondral graft, or as we named it, the “bony cartilaginous unit,” is a versatile graft that can be used for various purposes, such as a caudal extension graft, septal batten graft, spreader graft, and dorsal onlay graft.³ This technique was also successfully employed by Lee and colleagues for correcting an underdeveloped nasal septum in patients with short noses using a septal cartilage/ethmoid bone composite graft.⁷

I am pleased that other surgeons have had similar success in utilizing this osteochondral graft for rhinoplasty, but I expect that the use of our method should be acknowledged in this paper. I would be happy to provide any additional information required. Thank you for your consideration.

Amir Arvin Sazgar, MD,* and Ali Razfar, MD†

*Department of Otolaryngology, Head and Neck Surgery
Otorhinolaryngology Research Center, Tehran University of Medical
Sciences, Tehran, Iran

†Private Practice, The Aesthetic Centers, Newport Beach, CA

The authors report no conflicts of interest.

REFERENCES

1. Assiri H, Alarfaj A, Aloraini N, et al. Indications, stability, and surgical outcomes of using osteochondral nasal septal graft as a septal extension graft in rhinoplasty patients: a prospective cohort study. *J Craniofac Surg* 2024. doi:10.1097/SCS.00000000000010324
2. Chou DW, Farrior EH, Tamplen M. Novel osteochondral caudal septal extension graft in septorhinoplasty. *Facial Plast Surg Aesthet Med* 2022;24:310–311
3. Sazgar AA. The bony cartilaginous unit: the missing graft in septorhinoplasty. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Surg* 2016;45:1006–1008
4. Sazgar AA, Teimouri Y, Sazgar AK. Use of bone-cartilaginous unit in revision rhinoplasty. *Aesthet Surg J* 2019;39:841–847
5. Sazgar AA, Razfar A. Re: “Novel Osteochondral Caudal Septal Extension Graft in Septorhinoplasty” by Chou et al. *Facial Plast Surg Aesthet Med* 2022;24:312
6. Chou DW, Farrior E, Tamplen M. Response to Sazgar and Razfar re: “Novel Osteochondral Caudal Septal Extension Graft in Septorhinoplasty” by Chou et al. *Facial Plast Surg Aesthet Med* 2022;24:313
7. Lee SH, Koo MG, Kang ET. Septal cartilage/ethmoid bone composite graft: a new and improved method for the correction of underdeveloped nasal septum in patients with short noses. *Aesthetic Plast Surg* 2017;41:388–394

Some Reservations Regarding the Use of Artificial Intelligence Applications in the Peer Review Process of Scholarly Publications

To the Editor: Artificial intelligence (AI) tools, a topic that has been rapidly gaining popularity in recent times, continue to appear for many different purposes, especially in the academic field. Moreover, it seems that we will encounter it much more in the future. We try to follow these developments and discussions with interest. However, we sometimes find it difficult to keep up with the pace.

One important aspect of this issue that has recently attracted our attention is the debate on the role of AI applications in peer reviewing.^{1,2} In this correspondence, we aimed to express some of our reservations about the use of AI tools in the peer review process.

Habal³ stated that refereeing, like other skills, is a learned skill and develops over time as a lifelong learning experience. He also stated that referees are in a privileged position for the advancement of science.⁴ Similarly, Hwang⁵ expressed the need for less experienced writers and mentor-reviewers who encourage focus and illuminate.⁵ On the other hand, it is also known that academic journals sometimes have difficulties in finding competent reviewers.⁶

Another aspect of this process is the responsibility of the reviewers not to share information about the articles they review with anyone and to respect the authors' right to protect their ideas. However, serious problems in this regard have been reported in the literature. Perhaps the most interesting example of this situation is the one reported in a letter by Dansinger,⁷ *Dear Plagiarist: A Letter to a Peer Reviewer Who Stole and Published Our Manuscript as His Own*.

On the other hand, unintentional and more innocent problems may also arise. For example, as a result of an arbitrator receiving support from AI tools for the articles they review, the data of the article will be uploaded to AI algorithms. As it is known, AI tools process data inputs from many different sources. Afterward, AI applications can transform this information and share it with others. Perhaps in this case, the original ideas of the authors may have been transferred to others due to the algorithms of AI tools, even before they are

published as articles. This can lead to unintentional plagiarism.

In this context, a suggestion by Mollaki¹ that clear policies should be in place on whether or not to allow the use of AI-based tools in peer review is very valuable. We also believe that if reviewers, editors, or publishers are allowed to use AI applications in the review process of any manuscript, authors should be informed about this, and consent should be obtained from authors before submitting their manuscripts.

Finally, we believe that after a certain stage, the use of AI tools will be inevitable in the refereeing and editorial stages, just like in the article writing stage. However, these processes must be carried out in a fair, transparent, and ethical manner. For this reason, we think that these discussions in the literature can be very valuable in terms of providing ideas for the policies to be created.

İlhan Bahşi, MD, PhD,*

Yusuf Muhammed Durna, MD,[†]

Mustafa Said Tekin, MD,[‡] and

Yaşar Kemal Duymaz, MD[§]

*Department of Anatomy, Faculty of Medicine

Gaziantep University, Gaziantep

[†]Ear Nose and Throat Specialist, Private Practice

[‡]Department of Otolaryngology, Medipol Mega Hospital

Medipol University

[§]Department of Otolaryngology, University of Health Sciences

Umraniye Training and Research Hospital

Istanbul, Turkey

The authors report no conflicts of interest.

REFERENCES

1. Mollaki V. Death of a reviewer or death of peer review integrity? The challenges of using AI tools in peer reviewing and the need to go beyond publishing policies. *Res Ethics* 2024;20:239–250
2. Bahsi I, Balat A. What is the next level for artificial intelligence; may it have co-authoring, refereeing, and editorial roles in academic studies? *J Craniofac Surg* 2024;35:275–276
3. Habal MB. Inclusion, exclusion and equity in academic credentials in relation to the review process in scholarly publications. *J Craniofac Surg* 2021;32:2571–2572
4. Habal MB. Artificial intelligence—AI—present and future. The new revolution in global informatics; it is for sure for future generations to engulf and get used to. *J Craniofac Surg* 2024;35:1023–1024
5. Hwang K. A periodical article reviewer as Gottfried: The uncle of Jean-Christophe. *J Craniofac Surg* 2017;28:858–859
6. Bahsi I, Balat A. The influence of the reviewer in academic studies: may the paper make or break? *J Craniofac Surg* 2024;35:278
7. Dansinger M. Dear plagiarist: a letter to a peer reviewer who stole and published our manuscript as his own. *Ann Intern Med* 2017;166:143