Reviewer’s report

Title: A radiographic evaluation following the use of a novel cyclical force generating device in orthodontics.

Version: 1 Date: 9 May 2011

Reviewer: Arthur M Kemoli

Reviewer’s report:

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?

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.

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

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

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”!

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”.

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

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.

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.

Discussion:
Discussion should be about the present study and not about other studies. Only
comparison and contrast is made in reference to other studies. As it is very little has been discussed about what was observed in this study.

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