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Editor Comments:

1- The need for such a study should be mentioned background.

Under the Background section, line 21, I have added an explanation of the need for a systematic review of the literature on odontogenic necrotizing fasciitis.

2- What is the clinical implications of the study?

Under the Discussion section, paragraph five has been added which details and discusses the important clinical implications of this study.

3- You should discuss the strength and limitations of study in discussion. Otherwise, the discussion should be improved.

Under the Discussion section, paragraph six, the strengths and limitations of the study have been discussed in more detail and the discussion has been improved in the Discussion section.

4- Tables are not informative, the presentation of tables should be improved. Table 1 is not necessary and should be removed from paper.

The tables were improved and table 1 was removed and the tables renumbered. The old table 1 data is presented in the first paragraph of the Results section.

5- Table 2 should be re-reviewed. Some species were written twice....

Table 2 was renumbered to Table 1 and its redundant species data removed.