

Dear Editor:

The paper was revised according to the reviewer's suggestions. I hope that you and the reviewers will be satisfied with our revisions.

Regards,

Li Huang

Reviewer #1:

Specific Comments to Authors: This manuscript shows rich content, providing a deep insight for some works: the study is within the journal's scope, and I found it to be well-written, providing sufficient information. Even if the manuscript provides an organic overview, with a densely organized structure and based on well-synthesized evidence, there are some suggestions necessary to make the article complete and fully readable. For these reasons, the manuscript requires major changes. Please find below an enumerated list of comments on my review of the manuscript: INTRODUCTION: LINE 2: Please, correct the term "etiology" with "aetiology".

Response: Thank you for your kind suggestion. We have changed the word etiology to aetiology.

In the paragraph of the treatment alternatives, the authors mention the safety risks, about the orthognathic surgery; the periodontal risks due to a posterior-teeth intrusion should be pointed out, as the risks related to a second-molar extraction (see the following paper, for reference: "Prevalence and Characteristics of Accessory Mandibular Canals: A Cone-Beam Computed Tomography Study in a European Adult Population", Giuseppe Varvara, Beatrice Feragalli, Ilser Turkyilmaz, Aurelio D'Alonzo, Fabiola Rinaldi, Serena Bianchi, Maurizio Piattelli, Guido Macchiarelli and Sara Bernardi).

Response: Thank you for your kind suggestion. We have added the discussion of relative risks due to posterior teeth intrusion second molars extraction in the treatment alternatives part. The following paper "Prevalence and Characteristics of Accessory Mandibular Canals: A Cone-Beam Computed Tomography Study in a European Adult Population", Giuseppe Varvara, Beatrice Feragalli, Ilser Turkyilmaz, Aurelio D'Alonzo, Fabiola Rinaldi, Serena Bianchi, Maurizio Piattelli, Guido Macchiarelli and Sara Bernardi" was added in the reference.

Reviewer #2:

Specific Comments to Authors: This is a case report of successful orthodontic treatment of an open bite. The authors carefully describe their approach to the TMJ and show the relationship between the TMJ and the open bite. It is unfortunate that the long-term prognosis is unknown because the patient is unable to come back for a follow-up visit.

Response: Thank you for your comment. We called the patient for a follow-up visit 2 years after the treatment. It is a pity that the patient refused to come back because he moved to another city. On the phone, he reported no recurrence of open bite and TMJ pain during the 2-years retention period.