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Reviewer's report:

The authors modified the definition of the classification of sagittal jaw positions, and focused on the relative position of the upper and lower incisors as measured by the overjet. The description of the classification is now consistent in almost all the text (see below), even if the use of this single measurement for classification greatly reduce the interest of the study, as previously noted by the other reviewer.

Major compulsory revisions
Conclusions: …As a consequence, the treatment of postural disorders by correcting the sagittal position of the mandible is not advisable: This sentence, as noted in “Minor essential revisions”, 4, should run something like: … As a consequence, the treatment of postural disorders by correcting the sagittal position of the incisors is not advisable: overall, it seems to add very little to the scientific literature. Please omit.

Minor essential revisions
1. abstract, methods: …The subjects were subdivided in respect of the molar and canine relationship according to the Angle Classification…. This is not true. Please modify.
2. Results: The subjects were classified according to overjet, not according to Angle. Please correct.
3. In the new table 1, the number of subjects for each measurement has been omitted. This leaves this reviewer with the same question raised on the first version of the MS: why did some measurements have less subjects? (eg, the lordotic angle was measured only in 17 class I persons-now group A-, the kyphotic angle only in 28 class II persons, etc). Is this a problem deriving from the instrumentation?
4. Conclusions: …no correlations between the sagittal jaw position…[…]. As a consequence, the treatment of postural disorders by correcting the sagittal position of the mandible is not advisable.. Please note you focused on the sagittal position of the incisors, the text should be corrected.
5. Figure 1 focuses on “Cranioocervical relationship”, but this is not the matter of the present investigation. Please omit the figure (or just focus on overjet), because it would suggest to the reader a broader perspective than that can actually be find in the MS.

Discretionary revisions
In Results, please indicate which test produced the quoted p values (Anova, Sheffè, Kruskal-Wallis…).

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions
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