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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Professor Stamm,

we would like to thank you and the reviewers for revising our manuscript [HAFM-D-17-00103] entitled “Primary Failure of Eruption (PFE): A Systematic Review” and the constructive points discussed. The helpful comments and suggestions for improving the manuscript have been now incorporated into the revised version and manuscript changes were highlighted in the text in red color. In this letter, we provide a point-by-point response to each addressed comment. Therefore, we hope that the manuscript is now acceptable for publication in Head & Face Medicine.

Yours sincerely

Marcel Hanisch

Response to requests by the different reviewers

Reviewer #1:

Thank you for submitting this excellent review. Apart from one minor error on page 7 line 21, 'continues' should be 'continuing', there are no other problems. It is well written and comprehensive, as well as timely.

We would like to thank Reviewer #1 for the positive assessment of our manuscript! We have changed “continues” into “continuing”.

Reviewer #2:
The manuscript "Primary Failure of Eruption: A Systematic Review" provides a promising metaanalysis about the rare but important field of eruption failure. All orthodontists and oral- and maxillofacial surgeon has to treat those patients sometimes. Systematic reviews offered in literature are rare.

Originality

The review article is sufficiently novel, important and also interesting. An extensive present literature search in this field showed no other current metaanalysis with the same scope.

Structure

All in all, the review article is clearly laid out. All key elements are present. The title exactly describes the content of the article.

Introduction

The introduction describes accurately, what the authors tried to achieve. The introduction is relatively long, but the topic is complex and the information given in the introduction summarizes the relevant clinical experience up to now rather well.

Results

The described results support the claims of the discussion part rather good.

The last section is relatively long, but interesting and contains most current aspects of basic information and treatment options. In the last section of the review I saw some minor language problems that should be reviewed by a native speaker prior to publication.

Tables

The tables complete the required information from the text.

References

The reference list is up to date and covers a long time frame. After minor language revisions the manuscript can be accepted for publication.

We would like to thank Reviewer #2 for the positive assessment of our manuscript! After careful proofreading of the manuscript by a native speaker all detected errors were corrected.
Reviewer #3:

The headline is concise and hits the topic and the type of the article.

The summary describes the systematic review sufficient and focused on a consistent conclusion.

The background is limited to a descriptive definition and associated pathophysiological mechanisms of this rare disease are lacking. Type I-III is described rather briefly and might be more consistently taken up in the preparation of the data. Based on the rarity of the disease, the concise categorization and definition as the basis of a systematic algorithm is acceptable.

The genetic context is only briefly touched on. So the aim of this systematic literature review could be better explained, and might lead to a better genetic understanding and correct diagnosis in future. The method of literature review is based on two proven databases and valid keywords. The exclusion criteria and the selection of contributions included and excluded are stringent in view of the rarity of the disease.

The presentation of results might be structured a little bit more convenient to read, but follows consistently the previously established system. The corresponding table would be better not sorted chronologically but according to the degree of fulfillment of the (5) inclusion criteria.

In the discussion, the statements on the evidence of the selected articles could be more critical and clear. The comparison of the results with the systematic review by Ahmad et al. in 2006 is conclusive and concise. The discussion of genetic and non-genetic factors is sufficient in the context of a review. However, a more critical investigation of the clinical and radiological verifiability of the findings might be appropriate. The conclusion for the diagnostics and treatment options with regard to the individual circumstances are stringent. The list of literature is small but consistent with the logic of a systematic review of a rare disease.

We would like to thank Reviewer #3 for the assessment of our manuscript and the constructive points discussed!

Background-Section:

We have now explained the aim of this systematic review and the pathophysiological mechanisms of PFE more clearly.

Because of the introduction being long (see comments of Reviewer #2), we decided not to describe Type I-III more detailed.

Results-Section
We have also structured the results-section as you wanted more convenient. We have also restructured Table 3, now chronologically beginning with the publications including genetics and ending with the publications not including informations about genetics.

Discussion-Section:

The selected articles have been assessed more critically and the statements were edited.