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Reviewer's report (1):
Abstract:
1. In M&M – the author should state the clinic or Hospital where the subjects were recruited from. If patients were assigned to a group, what was the criteria used?

Unable to make changes as there is a word limit. These are described in main text.

2. In results – The author should state the total number of subjects, before even stating those who completed the study. From the sentence “measurements .....” to “-----individual tooth groups”., should be included in M&M not in results.

Changed to 14 out of 17

3. Conclusion – As it is now, this is confusing. Conclusion should be stated in line with the objective of the study.

Removed first conclusion

Introduction: 1. The second sentence here is too long and hence unclear to the reader.

Removed force induced remodeling

2. The first sentence in paragraph 2 is a repetition of what has already been stated. Could the other find a better scientific word for “bone in front” and "bone behind"!

The surrounding bone is remodeled

3. The objective of the study is not clearly expressed. For example how abo “---whether a novel device used in conjunction with ortho treatment produced detectable and measurable root resorption as generated on 3D images by a new computerized cone beam tomography”.

Changed in manuscript

M&M
1. I suggest the inclusion and exclusion criteria be summarized in a single paragraph.

It is clearer to reader if this is bullets.
2. Statistical analysis is rather confusing and can be improved on.
3. Results: Is full of repetitions. The author should just state the results as obtained and can appropriately refer the reader to the Tables. No explanation is necessary as this can be done in discussion.

**Changes made (please see in red)**

4. In “Parameters Measured” – All the explanation given here should have been in the M&M not in results. Only the figures obtained should be stated in the results section.

**Information placed in parameters measured**

**Conclusion**

Again as in Abstract, this should be based on the objective of the study. As it stands now, it is like results.

**Reviewer's report (2):**

1st conclusion=3D CBCT images provided an excellent to view root resorbtion during orthodontic treatment.

This was not the aim or objective of study, so I am skeptical about mentioning it.

**Removed**

**Introduction: 2nd paragraph, 2nd sentence= bone is flexible tissue: word flexible is not appropriate here, use alternative word= constantly remodeling**

**Changed**

Last paragraph of introduction Last word= ‘analysis’ isn’t it correct

**Changed**

Mention in discussion whether novel device applied cyclical force on anchor teeth or not?

**All teeth**