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Which of the following best describes what type of case report this is?: An unexpected event in the course of observing or treating a patient

Has the case been reported coherently?: No

Is the case report authentic?: No

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?: Yes

Is the case report persuasive?: No

Does the case report have explanatory value?: No

Does the case report have diagnostic value?: Yes

Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?: Yes

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

Question/Observation 1
In the Introduction section:
“Especially when it comes to tooth "difficult" (...)” should be “Especially when it comes to a "difficult" tooth (...)”

Question/Observation 2
In the Introduction section, what do the authors mean when the word “above” is used in the following sentence: “(...) but above does not cause damages (...)”

Question/Observation 3
One can see here another error in language:
“Pathological (late) fracture of the mandibular angle after the inferior third molar surgery occurs about in the 0.005% of the M3 removed.”

I will not report every language mistake that has being committed throughout the text. Thus, this manuscript needs a revision of English.

Question/Observation 4
The following sentence should not be at the Introduction section, but at the Results section. As the manuscript does not have a Results section, this “result” should be placed at the Discussion section.

“The cases reported in literature are 111 (Table I) (…)”

Question/Observation 5
If the title of the manuscript concerns late fractures and the authors reported only late fractures after third molar removal, so why is the aim of the paper to also discuss the immediate mandibular fractures during third molar removal? The authors have also collected only late cases in Table 1.

“The aim of the present paper is (…) to debate on the predisposing and related risk factors for both late and immediate fractures.”

Question/Observation 6
There are some mistakes in language. The following full sentence in the Discussion section, for example: “Are then important:”

Another example from the Discussion section:

“Also the our three cases (…)”

This manuscript needs a review of English.

Question/Observation 7
Where are the references for the following items/sentences?
- Dental mass and relative volume of impacted tooth;
- Type and class of tooth bone inclusion;
- Osbourne? Goldberg? (in Age of patients);
- “Data derived from progressively more extended cases studied, indicate the predominance of these fractures in subjects with an overall mean age of 39 years”. Which “more extended studies”?
- “On the contrary, some studies (…)”(in Age of patients) Which studies?
- “(…) the area osteoid and bone tissue does not appear before the 38th day” (in Time event);
- “(…) and males are more affected in relation to the greater muscular strength and to produce peak levels of biting forces as compared to females” (in Gender).

Question/Observation 8
In the Discussion section:
“Also the our three of pathological fracture of the mandibular angle were in the left side.”

How can the authors comment that the left side had a higher incidence of fractures in comparison with the right side if the third molar removal of the right side was not even performed in case reports 1 and 3!!!!

Question/Observation 9
The authors cannot conclude that “Pathological and iatrogenic fractures, late and immediate, after lower third molar surgical removal are infrequent events”, because the authors have not made an epidemiological study on the subject. This is probably a conclusion from another study.

Question/Observation 10
The authors cannot concluded that “Iatrogenic fracture is more directly related to the surgeon and the surgical procedure [2,4].” This is a conclusion from studies (references) 2 and 4.

Question/Observation 11
The authors cannot mention a new table (Table III) in the Conclusion section.

Question/Observation 12
Most part of the Conclusion section (if not all of it) is not a conclusion. It is a discussion based on results of other studies. Please conclude only the results (i.e. the case reports) from your study.

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published
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