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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. The aim of the study has to be more clear and consistent to the statistics used later in the study. In addition the aim of the study in the abstract has to be the same as the one reported in the introduction.

2. The reported conclusions are not based on the study results and are not consistent with the aim of the study.

   a. "...elongated SP should be considered in patients suffering from orofacial pain". I believe that we cannot really say that as there was no control group (without pain complaints) included in the study. In addition, 46% of the patients included in the study had not-elongated SP. The elongated SP seems to be related with the appearance of certain symptoms presented in Table 4.

   b. "CBCT is an effective method in the evaluation of length...and high quality images". This study did not examine the efficiency of using the CBCT in making the necessary measurements. This study presents the CBCT as an alternative method to CT or panoramic radiographs for the measurement and the assessment of the styloid process.

3. The section of statistical analysis and results are not clearly written. The reasons why the given test were chosen are also not very clear in the text. It could be easier for the reader to understand the results if the same order was used in both sections (statistics, results).

Minor Essential Revisions

Introduction

1. page 3 the sentence “Palpation of the styloid ...styloid” has to be rephrased

Materials and Methods

1. In the second paragraph I believe that it would be beneficial to the reader if the list of the clinical symptoms that were examined was briefly mentioned.

Discussion

1. page 9 The second sentence in the last paragraph “ The reason for different variations...imaging methods” ; instead of “was” better to use “could be”, as this is an assumption of the authors and not a certainty. In addition the authors could explain it a bit more, since this seems to be an important part of the study.
2. page 10 “narrower angle values” instead of “narrow angle values”
3. page 10 “which makes female patients…complaints” ; better to use “which could make female patients…” as again this is an assumption of the authors.
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