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Reviewer's report:

1. Do you believe the case report is authentic?
   
   Yes

2. Do you have any ethical concerns? Please consider if local Institutional Review Board approval or ethical approval was obtained (if appropriate) and if the patient (or their parent or guardian in the case of children under 18) gave written, informed consent to publish this case and any accompanying images. A statement to this effect should appear in the manuscript.
   
   Comments: No information about written informed consent of patients in the manuscript. The authors are needed to add statements about this.

3. Does the Introduction explain the relevance of the case to the medical literature?
   
   Yes

4. Does the article report the following information? Where information is missing, please specify.
   
   a. The relevant patient information, including:
      
      - De-identified demographic information (age, gender, ethnicity)
      
      - Main symptoms of the patient: not enough for case 2 and 3. It should be added that, the swelling was painful/painless or pedicled or not, rigit swelling or moving?more information about the lesions are needed.
      
      - Medical, family and psychosocial history enough
      
      - Relevant past interventions and their outcomes enough

   b. The relevant physical examination findings: enough.
c. Important dates and times in this case (if appropriate, organized as a timeline via a figure or table); if specific dates could lead to patient identification, consider including time relevant to initial presentation, i.e. initial presentation at T = 0, follow up at T = 1 month. enough

d. Diagnostic assessments, including:

   - Diagnostic methods: appropriate but in discussion section authors state that systemic diseases may be related ofm but in this case systemic diseases were not observed. do authors conclude this result according to the patient history or perform any blood test for eliminating the systemic conditions? if not authors should advise to perform blood tests for eliminating endocrinological diseases after pathological diagnosis of ofm.

   - Challenges (e.g., financial, language/cultural): appropriate

   - - Reasoning and prognostic characteristics (e.g., staging), where applicable: appropriate


e. Types and mechanism of intervention: appropriate

f. A summary of the clinical course of all follow-up visits: enough

Comments:

5. Is the interpretation (discussion and conclusion) well balanced and supported by the case presented?

Comments: yes

6. Is the anonymity of the patient protected? Please consider any identifying information in images such as facial features or nametags, whether the patient is named etc. If not, please detail below.

Yes

7. Is the Abstract representative of the case presented?

Comments: yes

8. Does the case represent a useful contribution to the medical literature?
Comments: this case report is interesting but had few contribution to the literature. In case 1 an intrabony lesion was diagnosed as OFM and this is very rare in the literature. Authors should state this rare condition in the manuscript. More explanation are needed about ofm and other mucinoid lesions according to clinical and radiological findings and emphasize intrabony characteristics.

9. Additional comments for the author(s)? well documented and interesting case. histological information is very strong in the manuscript. In case 1, odontogenic mxyoma was thought but ofm was diagnosed according to histological examination. more clinical and radiological information about odontogenic mxyoma and similarities and differences of ofm are needed. According to this, you can conclude that, the ofm can affect the adjacent bone and can misdiagnosed as odontogenic mxyoma. detailed histological examination is essential for certain diagnosis. Furthermore, more references are needed in the discussion section.
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Needs some language corrections before being published
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