condylar bone density) acts as a confounding factor and can give us biased results. Also, the numbers of boys and girls in the Class I, II, and III groups were not the same, so sex as a confounding factor affects the result.

Similarly, when the authors divided the subjects into hypodivergent, normovergent, and hyperdivergent groups, the number of Class I, II, and III cases and the sex of the subjects can act as confounding factors.[1] Nor did the authors mention the different adolescent age groups in the hyperdivergent and Class II groups versus other groups. It is quite possible that the results, which showed higher condylar bone density in Class II and hyperdivergent groups, might be due to a greater number of late adolescent subjects in these groups.

Another important point to be noted in the study is that the standard deviation is more than the difference between bone density in different groups.[2] The authors did not mention the 95% CIs. *P* value and CIs are common statistical measures that provide complementary information about probability and conclusions regarding the clinical significance of the study.[3] Therefore, if we calculate the CIs, the values of the bone density would overlap within different groups and make the results less clinically significant.

The value of difference in bone density of the different groups are very close to each other. For example, as mentioned in Table IV, total bone density difference in Class 1 and Class II is just 13 HU; when the samples are improperly distributed in terms of sex or age, that raises questions about clinical significance. Similarly, in Table III, normovergent and hyperdivergent groups have a difference of 21 HU in total bone density. The authors described the results to be statistically significant, but clinical significance of the results is doubtful.

Thus, the results can not be held as conclusive as stated in the conclusion of the article. These might be factors causing different bone densities, but again, the results can not be held as conclusive.

Sandhya Jain
Arwa Saifee
Indore, Madhya Pradesh, India

Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop 2019;155:306-7
0889-5406/$36.00

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajodo.2018.11.008

REFERENCES

1. Jain S, Debbarma S, Jain D. Bias in dental research/dentistry. Ann Int Med Dent Res 2016;2:2395-814.
2. Jain S, Sharma N, Jain D. Basic fundamentals of designing a quality research. J Adv Med Dent Sci Res 2015;3:88-95.
3. Gupta A. Interpreting research findings with confidence interval. J Orthod 2015;1:8.

Authors' response

Thank you very much for your interest in our article. We truly appreciate your insightful questions and valuable suggestions. We agree that all of the factors listed can influence condylar bone density, and that they may interact with one another in doing so. Optimally, a full factorial analysis would be conducted on these data. Unfortunately, this type of analysis requires a very large data set. When we attempted to combine predictors, the matrices contained a number of very small groups, and even some empty cells. This might have been acceptable if our predictors were continuous, but they are categoric, and empty cells do not support a sound analysis, Therefore, we chose to compartmentalize and separate the analysis to one of "main effects."

The numbers of subjects in the hyperdivergent, normovergent, and hypodivergent groups were provided in Table I, and the breakdowns for sex and age were also reported in the table. In a study with so many predictors, it is not possible to balance sample sizes across all predictors. Balancing cell sizes would optimize the power of the study, so the *P* values estimated are conservative.

We thank Drs Jain and Saifee for reminding us that there is an important difference between statistical and clinical significance. The results we reported are accurate, but the clinician must decide if they are relevant in a clinical context. For example, they note that, "In Table IV, total bone density difference in Class I and II is just 13 HU; when the samples are improperly distributed in terms of sex or age, that raises questions about clinical significance." Indeed, the reported mean (SD) and *P* values are accurate. The overall (omnibus) test for the total revealed a statistically significant difference across all groups ($P = 0.004$). The difference of 13 HU between Class I and Class II was not significantly significant. As indicated in the footnote to Table IV, the only

pairwise differences (HSD) that achieved significance were between Class II and Class III.

As stated clearly in the title, our article reported on "potential" predictors of mandibular growth patterns in adolescents. It is by no means conclusive, but it is a start. Further studies are required.

Ki-Jun Kim
Jae Hyun Park

R. Curtis Bay
Mi-Young Lee
Na-Young Chang
Jong-Moon Chae
Iksan and Seoul, Korea, and Mesa, Ariz

Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop 2019;155:307-8
0889-5406/$36.00

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajodo.2018.12.003