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Which of the following following best describes what type of case report this is?: None

Has the case been reported coherently?: Yes

Is the case report authentic?: Yes

Is the case report ethical?: Yes

Is there any missing information that you think must be added before publication?: Yes

Is this case worth reporting?: No

Is the case report persuasive?: No

Does the case report have explanatory value?: No

Does the case report have diagnostic value?: No

Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?: No

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

In evaluating the manuscript, this article does not seem to report new information about pathological mandibular fractures following third molar removal. The reported cases are not unusual/atypical presentations of this disease, and no innovative treatment has been presented.

1) As for English composition, it appears to be quite poor, as there are several elements and errors in grammar, vocabulary, phraseology, and clarity both in the text and in the figure legends that should be addressed and corrected.

The title of the manuscript just mention pathological late fractures, but there is some confusion in the text about information and data of late and immediate fractures that are sometimes presented together.
2) Table 1 should not be included in the Introduction section, and it should be thoroughly revised. In fact, there may be some mistakes: e.g. Libersa et al (2002) presented 27 cases of pathological fractures, but just 10 cases out of 27 were late. Furthermore, the Table should be more informative, including side, age of patients and etiology (mastication, trauma, yawning,...). Last but not least, if Authors want to draw conclusions from a review of the literature, a modern literature review should be performed and it should contain section Materials and methods, where the search strategy, inclusion and exclusion criteria should be specified.

Table 3 should be supported by literature data too.

3) References to Figure 4c, 4d, 5b, and 5g are lacking in the text.

4) In the Discussion section, Authors should provide citations from article in the literature to their affirmations, such as "There are cases in which impacted tooth occupies a large mandibular space, also more than 50%"; "The risk is double for total inclusions"; "On the contrary, some studies do not emerge differences in incidence between patients 40 years old and greater and those below age 40";...

5) There are some mistakes to be corrected in the Discussion section (e.g. in the Time event paragraph, Perry referred 28 cases and Wagner 17)

6) The Authors do not mention about the possibility of the lack of compliance to soft diet by the patients in spite of recommendations by dental practitioners. This should be added, otherwise late mandibular fractures following third molar extraction could all be misconstrued as evidence of malpractice in our litiginous society.

In conclusion, I do not think that this article is appropriate for publication in the Journal of Medical Case Reports

**Quality of written English:** Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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