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**Reviewer’s report:**

Major compulsory revisions:
Firstly, the prediction tables studied in this paper were by Robert Edison MOYERS. Thus, the possessive would be MOYERS’.
Secondly, in Tables 3 and 4, it is not stated what Moyers percentile is being used in the comparison? 50th? 75th?
Thirdly, the so-called "Tanaka-Johnston" method is usually applied as quick approximation to Moyers' 75th percentile: half the lower incisor widths plus 11 for the upper 345; half the lower incisor widths plus 10.5 for the lower 345. It is not common to employ their actual regression equations. Thus in Table 5, it is not clear which Tanaka-Johnston percentile has been used in the comparisons. The 50th percentile (the one that the equations would spit out), the 75th (the one both Moyers and Tanaka and Johnston recommend using), or the 75th as estimated from the 11/10.5 approximation. Further the title of Table 5 is unclear: "regression values of the actual sum" is confusing; regression values and actual values are different, even in very good predictions.
Lastly, it should be noted that this investigation is easy to do and has been done for almost every population, especially those in the Third World. To my recollection, most of these studies have shown a correlation between the lower incisors and the unerupted buccal segments of about 0.65. In contrast, this paper reports correlation coefficients that are much higher (~0.8). It seems to me that the authors must comment on this discrepancy and its potential genetic basis.
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