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Reviewer’s report:

1. Thank you for allowing me to review your manuscript.
2. I will restrict my comments to content, but suggest editor review since some of the English translation is awkward (Minor Essential Revisions).
3. Background- Ultrasonography, ultrasound, and sonography are all used; consider using one consistent term (Minor Essential Revisions).
4. Methods- Consider adding description (or table) of the Graf classification and moving description of Terjesen classification to accompany your description of how the values were obtained (Discretionary Revision).
5. Methods- Suggest having titles for tables and figures (Minor Essential Revisions).
6. Methods- Table 1 lists "shape the bony roof" and "position of the cartilaginous roof"; suggest having working definitions of the subjective terms. Without working definitions, I do not feel that reliability can or needs to be determined for the subjective parameters (Major Compulsory Revision).
7. Methods- For statistical analysis, consider adding statement and example of what constitutes "good" and/or "acceptable" agreement (Minor Essential Revision).
8. Results and discussion- Consider separating results from discussion (Minor Essential Revisions).
9. Results and discussion- For objective scorings, if mean scores are from negative to positive, then consider using "+" sign, so alpha angle mean "-5.12 - 5.61" would become "-5.12 - +5.61" (Minor Essential Revisions).
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