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Reviewer's report:

The authors do address some but not all of the raised queries.

1. Methods and Materials, Paragraph “Ethical Approcal”: the expression “convinced” should probably be replaced by “informed” The last sentence “There was no dissatisfaction after the surgery from the side of patients and authors.” Should be removed.

2. The authors do give some basic patient characteristics in the Result section, but there is also a need for a statement in the Methods and Materials section such as: The clinical characteristics included gender, age, initial diagnosis, co-morbidity, operation time, complications etc. Probably these data should be given in a Table “patient characteristics”

3. No response needed.

4. Still there is some lack of how the authors evaluated patients satisfaction and cosmetic outcome (Did you grade the satisfaction as poor, modest, good, excellent; did you apply an analogue scale for the various characteristics you mention: extrusion, asymmetry, bone depression, and irregularity) The last Paragraph of the Result section give some information on the evaluation process and should be moved to Methods and Materials: “Also patients’ satisfaction was usually described by symmetry and regularity that revealed a remarkable satisfied result among our patients. The more important criteria to describe satisfaction of the surgery were based on the clinical follow up by the surgeons that revealed no extrusion, asymmetry, bone depression and irregularity.”

5. No response needed.

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.