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Dear Editor,

Thank you for considering the revised version of our manuscript. We are thankful to Dr. Mohammad Y Hajeer for pointing out some problems need further modification and giving us a lot of meaningful suggestions. We have changed the manuscript point by point in response to the reviewer’s concerns.
Reviewer: Mohammad Y Hajeer

Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

(1) In the 'Introduction' section, a small paragraph should be added at the end of this section and before the last paragraph. The required paragraph should prepare the reader about the new appliance that was developed at your University. Then it comes to the reader that we need to see its effects on a sample of Class III patients.

Thank you for your suggestion. We have added a new paragraph to introduce this new appliance to the reader.

(2) In the 'Materials and Methods' section, no need for the hand-and-wrist radiograph assessment (i.e. no need for the skeletal age assessment). We have mentioned before that the use of these images are not required to commence the study. Treatment of Class III patients is not related to any skeletal age estimation. It is well known that we need to treat Class III patients as soon as they are presented in the clinic.

We have removed the hand-and-wrist radiograph assessment part in this manuscript.

(3) In the 'Materials and Methods' section, the results of Dahlberg's assessment of the error of the method are not given. They should have been given in a separate table or a summary of the results should have been given in the body of the text.

We have added a summary of the results in the end of the paragraph.

(4) In the 'Materials and Methods' section, the authors mentioned 'inter-observer' and 'intra-observer' concepts. We have only requested intra-observer reliability. Systematic error was mentioned here. They need to say there were no systematic errors between the two repeated measurements (at the two assessment times) i.e. no significant differences applying paired t tests.

We have added a summary of the results according to the reviewer's suggestion.

(5) In the 'Materials and Methods' section, at the end of this section, the authors mention that they applied t test. They should have used the following sentence: ‘Two-sample t tests were applied to detect significant differences between the two groups by comparing treatment-induced changes versus growth-only-induced changes.’

We have changed the sentence according to the reviewer’s advice. Thank you.

(6) In the 'Materials and Methods' section, sample size calculation of the main study has not been calculated. The authors are advised to explain how they calculated sample size. Why did they choose 20 subjects? What are the assumptions beyond their calculation.

In the paper “Short-term soft and hard-tissue changes following Class III treatment using a removable mandibular retractor: a randomized controlled
I am sorry that we didn’t read your paper before we designed this study. We calculate the sample size by using the formula below:

\[ n = \left( \frac{Z_{2\alpha} + Z_{2\beta}}{\sqrt{2(\sigma^2)}} \right)^2 \times \frac{(\mu_1 - \mu_2)^2}{(\mu_1 - \mu_2)^2} \]


Based on this formula, 8-10 patients in one group should be enough for this pilot study.

In our study, we included 36 patients in experimental group and 20 patients in control just for increasing the sample size to reduce the statistical error.

(7) In the Results section, the 'morphological changes' should be replaced by 'occlusal changes'. All the subheading of 'Maxillomandibular relationships, etc..' should be deleted as has been suggested in my first review of this paper. All the important findings should be given in complete paragraphs of balanced sizes. You need to 'merge' all of your paragraphs together in one or two somewhat long paragraphs.

We have deleted the subheadings and merged the results part to two paragraphs.

(8) In the Discussion section, you need to compare your results with other appliances in the literature. I suggest comparing your results with those of the RMR (Removable Mandibular Retractor; Here is the reference: ‘Short-term soft and hard-tissue changes following Class III treatment using a removable mandibular retractor: a randomized controlled trial’. Orthod Craniofac Res. 2013 May;16(2):75-86. doi: 10.1111/ocr.12007 By Saleh et al. Since the age range in this study is close to your study. Also, you may compare your results with the chin cap therapy. You have already mentioned this by going back to citations 32-34. But please take into account the recently published paper by Saleh et al 2013 about Class III treatment in order to allow the reader to compare treatment efficiency.

Thank you for providing us this great paper. We are very happy to find the main significant findings were similar between these two studies following class III treatment by using different methods.

Minor Essential Revisions

In the Abstract

(1) 'discrepancies' should be 'discrepancy'

done

(2) Another 20 untreated patients, should be 'Another group of 20 untreated patients,...'

done

(3) 'according to upper criteria' should be 'with the same level of deformity'

done

(4) 'a t test was used' should be 'a two-sample t test was used'
In the Materials and Methods section:
(8) All the referral to figures should be given like this: Figure 1, Figure 2.. (i.e. respecting that the first letter should always be capital).

In the Discussion section:
(9) the last sentence should take into account that the MOA-III was effective in the treatment of mild to 'moderate' Class III malocclusion in children.

In the Conclusions:
(10) we need to see only three conclusions without any repetition of the sentences. One conclusion is an overall conclusion. Second one about hard tissue changes. Third one about soft-tissue changes and overall appearance. Tables should be shortened. Tables 2,3 and 4 should be shortened. Variables that are not important could be removed.

We have changed the conclusion into 3 parts according to the reviewer’s suggestion. And we also shortened the table 2,3 and 4.(because we deleted table 1, now they are table 1,2 and 3)

Figures are OK
Figures legends are OK.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being Published.

We used the English Language Editing service available from Elsevier's WebShop(http://webshop.elsevier.com/languagediting/) to correct English grammar, syntax, and spelling. we hope it could be good enough for publication. Thank you.

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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