

Dear Lucas Moura Sousa, Thales Fabro Vanzela Sverzut, Marcelo Santos Bahia, Jessica Luana dos Santos, Jorge Esquiche Leon, Alexandre Elias Trivellato, Cássio Edvard Sverzut:

Your submission Condylar fracture due to sports trauma associated with a solitary bone cyst: a case report. Fratura condilar devido a trauma esportivo associado com cisto ósseo solitário: relato de caso. to Brazilian Dental Science, has been revised and according to reviewers' comments, there are questions to be addressed and/or points to be clarified/corrected.

Please answer the reviewers considerations point-by-point in a separate document and also please make all the corrections in the text highlighted in yellow.

Deadline: 30 days

Thank you for considering Brazilian Dental Science for publishing your research. We are looking forward the revised version of you manuscript.

Sincerely,

-----  
Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Revisions Required  
-----

**Questionnaire**

Does the manuscript contain new and significant information to justify publication?\*

Yes

Does the Abstract (Summary) clearly and accurately describe the content of the article?

Yes

Is the problem significant and concisely stated?

Yes

Are the methods or research design described comprehensively? Is the statistical analysis adequate?

Yes

Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the results?

Yes

Is adequate reference made to other work in the field?

Yes

Is the language acceptable?

Yes

### **Manuscript Structure**

Length of article is:\*

Adequate

Number of tables is:

Adequate

Number of figures is:

Adequate

**Please state any conflict(s) of interest that you have in relation to the review of this paper (state “none” if this is not applicable).**

None

**Rating**

Interest\*

Excellent

Quality

Good

Originality

Excellent

Overall

Good

**Recommendation**

Minor Revision

**Would you be willing to review a revision of this manuscript?**

Yes

## **Comments**

### *Comments to the Author*

I would like to commend the authors for presenting a well-documented and clinically valuable case involving a solitary bone cyst associated with a condylar pathological fracture, an uncommon condition with relevant implications for diagnosis and treatment in Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery. The manuscript offers detailed clinical, surgical, radiographic, and histopathological information, contributing meaningfully to the limited literature on this topic.

Below are some suggestions intended to enhance the clarity, accuracy, and scientific rigor of the manuscript. These recommendations correspond to specific points identified during the review:

Title: Do not use a period at the end of the title, in accordance with journal formatting standards.

Discussion – First paragraph:

The opening statement indicates that several different types of jaw cysts associated with pathological fractures are listed in Table 1. However, Table 1 includes exclusively cases involving solitary bone cysts. This discrepancy may mislead readers and must be corrected to accurately reflect the table's content.

Discussion – Redundancy:

The third paragraph repeats etiopathogenic mechanisms and demographic characteristics already described in the preceding paragraph. To improve

conciseness and readability, these sections should be combined or streamlined to avoid duplication and form a single cohesive explanation of SBC epidemiology and proposed etiological theories.

Discussion – Unit correction:

The expression “5.9 mL<sup>3</sup>” is not a valid unit. Please revise to mL or cm<sup>3</sup>.

Discussion – Diagnostic phrasing:

The expression “lead to a diagnosis” is overly deterministic and should be replaced with “support the diagnosis”, which more accurately reflects the clinical reasoning involved.

Discussion – Histopathological clarification:

The potential risk of confusing the lesion with osteosarcoma should indeed be highlighted, but the explanation requires clearer contextualization. Emphasize that this diagnostic pitfall is uncommon and depends on correlation with clinical and radiographic findings.

Language correction:

Replace “younger patient” with “younger patients” to maintain grammatical accuracy.

These refinements will strengthen the manuscript’s clarity and coherence, ensuring that the important clinical contribution offered by this case is conveyed with maximal scientific rigor.

-----

-----

Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

-----

**Questionnaire**

Does the manuscript contain new and significant information to justify publication?\*

Yes

Does the Abstract (Summary) clearly and accurately describe the content of the article?

Yes

Is the problem significant and concisely stated?

Yes

Are the methods or research design described comprehensively? Is the statistical analysis adequate?

Not Applicable

Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the results?

Yes

Is adequate reference made to other work in the field?

Yes

Is the language acceptable?

Yes

### **Manuscript Structure**

Length of article is:\*

Adequate

Number of tables is:

Adequate

Number of figures is:

Adequate

**Please state any conflict(s) of interest that you have in relation to the review of this paper (state “none” if this is not applicable).**

None

**Rating**

Interest\*

Excellent

Quality

Good

Originality

Excellent

Overall

Excellent

**Recommendation**

Minor Revision

**Would you be willing to review a revision of this manuscript?**

Yes

**Comments**

*Comments to the Author*

Minor language revision

---