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Author’s response to reviews:

Replies to Editors’ comments

First thing: when the authors revise their manuscript they should remember to highlight the changes applied to the manuscript by marking them with a different color, in order the editor can immediately see them. the authors failed to do that. please do it accordingly.

We are sorry for the inconvenience. We follow the request to not include track changes or highlighting and to submit a clean version of the paper.

1. english form should be improved by the help of a native english speaker.

Thank you for the suggestion. Paper has been edited by native English speaker.

2. title is OK

3. abstract is structured and ok but i would appreciate the authors can in some way introduce the significance of the masks and their use because not all bmc oral health readers are orthodontists. one sentence in the background of the abstract should be sufficient.
We would to thank the editor for his suggestion. Background section of the abstract has been modified as follow: “Maxillary protraction with facemask (FM) is an orthopedic approach for treatment of Class III growing patients. Aim of the present investigation was to analyze tension loads produced by two different facial mask (FM) designs on facial skin of subject with skeletal Class III”

4. background is appropriate but the first sentence lacks of literature support (please add references here). in addition, please separate different paragraphs in order the reader is facilitated when reading. the purpose of the study should stand alone. the intro should be separated by the methods.

Thank you for your suggestion. References have been added at the end of first sentence. All the paragraphs have been separated.

5. methods. i suggest the authors to better underline the variables investigated in this study. why not to structure the methods in different paragraphs? please separate methods from the results with space. format is important.

Thank you for your suggestion. Method section has been structured in 2 different paragraphs.

6. Results. please separate them from discussion.

As suggested Results section was separated from discussion.

7. discussion. please expand this chapter by comparing your results with outcomes obtained in other studies, please add more literature. a paragraph giving the limitations of the present investigation is missing and i believe it is mandatory. please separate discussion from the conclusions.

As suggested, discussion section has been separated from conclusions and expanded. A limitation paragraph has been added.

8. conclusions. conclusions should not present that structure please remove points and put all together. in addition the clinical significant sentence is missing what are the clinical benefits or effects of your present investigations? what are the limits of your present investigations? which studies you suggest for the future in order to better investigate this topic?

Structure of conclusions section has been modified as suggested.
9. references are ok but should be more, please add.

As suggested, more references have been added.

10. figures are ok but please expand the legends in order to better describe your findings.

As suggested, legends to figures have been expanded