

Peer Review File

Article information: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21037/fomm-21-7>

1. The current paper does not follow the order for the MANUSCRIPT SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS from FOMM (e.i: abstract, keywords and conflict statement sections. Please amend

Reply: Thank you for spotting this. We have amended the manuscript following the manuscript submission requirement accordingly.

2. Introduction

- Lines 70-78: This paragraph is difficult to read. Please expand, re-order and amend

Reply: Thanks and it is now rephrased and amended

3. Lines 76-78: Regarding the importance of EDS in patients' routine, please reference and expand i.e: different subjective methods, etc...

Reply: As suggested, the section is now amended and expanded the references. The methods to screen OSA is mentioned under section “Diagnosis, Treatment Objectives and Surgical Planning”

4. lines 80-84: Missing data success and cure rates of CPAP and % rates of non-adherence to treatment, please reference.

Reply: The cure rate of CPAP and % rate of non-adherence and the references are amended.

5. Body of the manuscript and methodology followed the narrative checklist review.

- line 135: Please consider changing or omitting 'surgical planning' or this subheading as it is confusing.

Reply: Thanks for the suggestion. The phrase of “Surgical planning” is deleted

- Lines 156-162: Please consider expand on both the different soft tissue and hard tissue surgeries, cure rates, etc.

Reply: Thank you for your suggestion, which we consider both soft tissue and hard tissue surgeries and their cure rates are both important aspects of OSA treatment. However, the authors would like to keep this manuscript as a focused narrative review of the topic of skeletal surgical treatment.

6. Good job reviewing and updating the literature about OSA bone surgery. The paper is well written and well structured. I decided to accept the paper without changes

Reply: We thank Reviewer B's support of accepting this manuscript.

7. The authors presented an interesting paper on The Role of Skeletal Surgical Treatment in the Management of Obstructive Sleep Apnea.

The author's work with scientific evidence(s) is/are also based on clinical designs, sample sizes, clinical observations, and statistical research findings.

Would the author(s) be able to report his/her study designs, reporting some p-values, sample sizes, and measurements of effect estimates based on their review of literature? What is/are the level of scientific evidence(s) on their review?

Reply: We thank the comment of Reviewer C. This submission is a narrative review for a better understanding of the discussed topic in a broader manner. The authors did not attempt to perform a systematic review and meta-analysis on the topic, which would require to define a more specific and narrow clinical question and would not serve the same purpose as a narrative review.