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**Reviewer's report:**

1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined? The question posed by the authors is understood. However, the cranial base is a radiographic landmark that is often poorly defined in lateral cephalometric radiographs due to overlapping anatomic structures. Therefore, its usefulness in a general sense is limited for extrapolated comparison to a particular population. The authors well note the inconclusive findings for cranial base angle. I understand that a power analysis was performed, however the study population is still considered small for the population defined in this report.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work? The use of lateral cephalometric radiographs is becoming a less viable option due to the increasing availability of cone beam 3 dimensional CT-scan technology. Reformation of the saggital view with less overlap for landmark identification is preferred. The use of cephalometric two dimension radiographs is acceptable for initial investigations, but further evaluation should be comparatively used.

3. Are the data sound and well controlled? Given the technology used, it is adequate for an initial investigation.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? The standards appear followed.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? The major relevant points appear addressed with age, growth, sex. This study population grouped male and female together. The age group appears university aged.

6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? Title and abstract are ok.

7. Is the writing acceptable? The writing is grammatically acceptable.

Please make your report as constructive and detailed as possible in your comments so that authors have the opportunity to overcome any serious deficiencies that you find and please also divide your comments into the following categories:

-----------------

Please number your comments and divide them into:
- Major Compulsory Revisions
  none
- Minor Essential Revisions
  Please review recent evaluations to ensure most current estimations regarding other contemporary studies.
- Discretionary Revisions
  none

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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