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Reviewer’s report:

Reviewer #3: Dear Editor,

The paper was significantly improved and it is suitable for the publication on "Head & Face Medicine"

Our response:

We have already addressed the issue of reproducibility and are well aware of the imminent problems arising from using non-standardized photography. The main problem remains that even with a standardized setup of the orthodontic patient group, Powered by Editorial Manager® and ProduXion Manager® from Aries Systems Corporation the very same parameters cannot be reproduced or checked upon in the publicly available material that was analyzed. We reckon that the important information deriving from our results is the existence of a highly significant difference between commercially accepted representation of facial features and those commonly provided by bracket manufacturers and consequently deriving results represented in orthodontic textbooks. Even if the differences were lesser after application of a standardized setup, they would still be there and thus the same results also.

- Ok, well done

Our response: Thank you for your comment! Regretfully, for copyright reasons we are unable to add any of the photographic material.

- OK

… and a graph in addition or instead of the tables.

Our response: Thank you for your suggestion. We added "figure 2" to the revised version of the manuscript because in complements table 2 in a favorable manner.

- Ok, well done

Our response: Thank you for you recommendation. We amended the conclusion part in revised version of the manuscript. Please also see below (response to comment of reviewer #4).
Ok, well done
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