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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript deals with different effects following the early extraction of compromised first permanent molars by carrying out a systematic review including a meta analysis. Overall, the manuscript seems like an insightful contribution, as it covers an extensive overview of a topic of general interest. Worth noting is the authors' effort to conduct a meta-analysis. However, some concerns remain that should be considered.

As a general point: Some of the included studies are described in great detail. Given the many aspects and studies covered by the article, it is hard to follow these details in full depth.

The article contains various formal mistakes:

- The reference numbers in the tables do not align with those in the text

- Moreover, the reference list contains several errors and seems messy. Some examples: the declaration of the author names is unsystematic, some references appear twice, one reference has no author, access dates concerning web links are missing, etc.

- When describing the strength and limitations of the included articles, the authors mention one article with weak strength (Page 15). However, Table 2 indicates that there are two (Ast et al., 1961 and Rahhal, 2014).

- A heading in Table 1 ("Effect in third molar development and eruption") is misplaced.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess
Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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