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Dr. de Abreu:

We thank you for this opportunity to resubmit a revised version of our manuscript "A clinical prediction rule to identify difficult intubation in children with Robin sequence requiring mandibular distraction osteogenesis based on craniofacial CT measures". We have addressed all comments and concerns expressed by the reviewers and editors, and hope our manuscript is now acceptable for publication in BMC Anesthesiology. Our point-by-point responses are appended below.

Kindest Regards

Corresponding authors
Editor Comments:

I suggest to ask for help by an English native speaker, as the language needs revision. Otherwise, the manuscript improved a lot and I feel comfortable to accept the submission, once the language revision is done. BMC Anesthesiology operates a policy of open peer review, which means that you will be able to see the names of the reviewers who provided the reports via the online peer review system. We encourage you to also view the reports there, via the action links on the left-hand side of the page, to see the names of the reviewers.

Response: Thank you for your comments. An English-language science editor has carefully revised the manuscript as requested.

Reviewer 1:

1. P3 line 3 "Prediction rule of D1 with robin sequence will possibly be established" - this statement makes no sense.

Response: Thank you very much for your comments. We have rewritten the Abstract Conclusion for clarity (Page 3, Lines 4–7).

2. P5 line 23 should add 'a' (to find a new method)

Response: The passage has been revised accordingly (Page 5, Line 5).

3. P7 line 1 included should read 'including'

Response: The sentence has been revised (Page 7, Line 12).

4. P10 line 28 spelling error - shouting should read 'a shorter'

Response: This error has been corrected (Page 9, Line 22).

5. P11 line 1 should read 'a non-radiation method' or 'non-radiation methods'

Response: The phrasing has been changed to 'radiation-free methods' (Page 10, Line 12).
6. P12 line 50 should read 'early identification' not early identify.
Response: Thank you. This has been corrected (Page 11, Line 13).

7. P13 line 36 This statement makes no sense - do you mean to say that patients that had greater than 3 intubation attempts? doesn't make sense that they have had greater than 3 intubations.
Response: We have thoroughly revised the Discussion for clarity, including this sentence (Page 12, Line 8).