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Dear Editor,

We have read and acted upon your Referees’ comments on our manuscript entitled ‘Coronectomy as a surgical approach to impacted mandibular third molars: a systematic review’. (Authors: Andrea Martin, Giuseppe Perinetti, Fulvia Costantinides and Michele Maglione; Reference MS: 2069339887150765). We would therefore be glad if you would consider the enclosed amended manuscript for publication in *Head and Face Medicine*, considering also our replies to your Referees’ comments.

Finally, we hope that after consideration of the modifications listed below (highlighted in red in the manuscript), you and your Referees will feel that our manuscript fulfils the high standards of the *Head and Face Medicine*, and is suitable for publication.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,

Fulvia Costantinides, DDS, MSc
(For and on behalf of the Authors)
Reviewer 1:

1. I suggest that authors can insert a fluxogram of the results, because it makes it easier to read in their understanding and less boring.

R: The authors do believe that a detailed summary of results has been provided in Table 2. Therefore, the Authors would like to leave only the table as it was in the original version to avoid redundant repetitions of results.

Reviewer 2:

1) In the abstract, if we consider the ten articles qualified for the final analysis the incidence of inferior alveolar nerve injury should be range from 0% to 9.5% and the lingual nerve injury from 0% to 2%. The reference 59 (Monaco G et al. JADA 2012) was the study in which authors did not report any nerve injury.

R: The abstract has been modified accordingly (Pag. 2).

2) In the introduction the reference 13 is cited about orthodontic extrusion but I think that the Pogrel study is only about coronectomy.

R: The introduction has been modified accordingly. Reference 13 has been changed as reference 14 (Pag. 3)

3) In the paragraph “Teeth investigated, surgical treatment and adjunct pharmacological treatments.” Of the six studies cited (13,22,24,25,59,60) the study 59 made also prophylactic antibiotic therapy.

R: Studies no. 59 and 14 made also prophylactic antibiotic therapy. This information has been added in the paragraph (Pag. 9).

4) In the paragraph “Clinical outcomes.” Authors should change the percentage of IANI because the study of Monaco G et al. (ref. 59) reported a 0% of IANI incidence. I think that the range should be from 0% to 9.5%.

R: The paragraph has been modified accordingly (Pag. 10).

5) Always in the paragraph “Clinical outcomes.” Regarding the incidence of pain the range should be from 2% (ref. 59) to 41.9% (ref.17) and not from 1.1% to 41.9%. Also in this case is the reference 59 that change the range of pain incidence. Moreover, regarding the Hatano et al. study I think that they found statistically significant differences between the two groups about the post-operative pain.

R: In the study by Cilasun et al., no cases (0%) of pain were observed in the control group (n = 87), and one single case was observed after a total of 88 coronectomies (1.1%). For this reason the range reported was 1.1%-41.9%. Regarding Hatano et al. study, we added in the text that they: “found significant differences in post-operative P in the comparison between the control group
(6.78%, 8/118) and the coronectomy group (18.6%, 19/102) with a p-value of 0.012 [16]” (Pag. 11).

6) In the “Discussion” section authors should point out that antibiotic therapy in prophylaxis should improve the clinical post-operative outcomes. The Monaco et al. study was the only one performed with antibiotic prophylaxis and the post-operative incidence of infection was very low.

**R: authors pointed out this result in the Discussion section (Pag. 15).**

7) I agree with Authors conclusions anyway I believe that the operator technique is very important for the final clinical success but most of the published studies do not describe the clinical protocol employed. Authors could point out this aspect that needs more attention by the Authors of the different studies cited in the revision.

**R: authors pointed out this result in the Discussion section (Pag. 17).**