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Dear Editor,

Please find attached the revised manuscript entitled “Accuracy evaluation of CAD/CAM generated splints in orthognathic surgery: A cadaveric study,” which I wish to submit for publication in the Head and Face Medicine.

We have taken into account all the criticisms and requested clarifications raised by the reviewers.

We thank you for your editorial help and the referees, which have certainly improved the quality of our paper.

With my best regards,

Yours sincerely,

Paolo Scolozzi, MD,DMD
Point-by-point description of the changes made:

Reviewer # 1: Fábio P Costa
Reviewer's report:

Dear Authors,

This article was a well conducted research and a minor revision should be performed:

- If the surgical procedures were performed by the same operator or by different operators, it may be suitable to add this information into the “Surgical Procedure” section.

The surgical procedure has been performed by the same surgeon. This has been added in the “Surgical Procedure” section as suggested.

Reviewer # 2: Mario Isiordia
Reviewer's report:

The authors should review the Consort Guidelines for reporting clinical trials. A flow diagram showing all stage of study could be included.

There is not an aim in the introduction section. Please, add the adequate purpose of the study.

How was done the randomization? What was the method used?

The blinding is no clear. Who were blinding?

In the statistical analysis was not specified which is the p value considered how statistical differences.

Figure 1 is no clear and could be deleted and data could be included in a table.

Tables are confusing. Table 1 could contain the sociodemographic and surgical data only. Table 2 could include the data about analgesic effectiveness and side effects only. Thus, the results should be rewriting according this sequence.

The authors should be checked literature more thoroughly.


• Isiordia-Espinoza MA, Orozco-Solís M, Méndez-Gutiérrez EP, Tobías-Azúa FJ.


Please, increase the number of references with a critical review. Review the references included in this manuscript because some they are not according to the format of the journal.

This Reviewer’s report refers to another article than ours.