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„Clinical complications during treatment with a modified Herbst appliance in combination with a lingual appliance”

General comments
The objective of the present paper was to evaluate complications with the conventional and the modified lingual Herbst appliance. The authors compared the types and the amount of clinical complications.

Abstract
The abstract gives a good summary of the work.

Main manuscript
The introduction leads the reader to the difficulties that can arise while using the Herbst appliance for treating a class II malocclusion. These complications differ depending by using a lingual appliance in combination with a bukkal Herbst appliance or the conventional Herbst appliance with telescopes.

The subjects and methods are well described. But there is not mentioned how the patients were chosen. Were there any exclusion or inclusion criteria? The further information about the study group is sufficient and the work could be carried out again. The statistical analysis is described well. The descriptive analyze is adequate in this particular case. If there had been the aim to analyze more influencing factors affecting the complications the authors would have done further statistics.

The results are well depicted. The differentiation between „mild“ and „severe“ is reasonable and the listing of the complications in table 2 gives a good overview. The results were compared to data from other authors and well weighted. But there is no information given about the search strategy. Table 3 contains data about different publications but there is no distinction between WIN and Incognito in the column „Lingual Apparatur + Herbst“. Further it would be fine if there would be the English expression (Lingual appliance + Herbst). On page 8 there is a missing „)“. The conclusions are convincing. The results of this work were described and the deduction is argumentative.

From my point of view the acceptance of the word is recommended after minor
essential revisions.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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

**Declaration of competing interests:**

I declare that I have no competing interests.