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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

We would like to thank you for the positive and constructive comments from both the reviewers. The responses to the reviewers’

Reviewer Tarek El-Bialy:
Comment 1: Please spell out SLB and CB first time mentioned (Lines 62, 63)
Response: I have spell out SLB and CB in abstract section.

Comment 2: Change the word "velocity) to "rate) throughout the manuscript
Response: I have changed it.

Comment 3: Sentence line 71 "even though" consider rephrasing
Response: I have rephasing it.

Comment 4: Conclusion, first line needs rephrasing
Response: I have rephasing it.

Response to Reviewer Renato Parsekian Martins:
Comment 1: I have identified several sentences copied from previous reports. Therefore I am rejecting this manuscript.
Response: We appreciate the reviewer’s comments and we agree with the reviewer’s suggestion that we should not copy sentence from previous reports. But I have already identified the source of the literature.

Editor’s comment:
Comment 1: Authors should specify that they did or did not include studies that
used TADs in them.
Response: we do not includ sthdies that used TADs in this study. Detail see Study Selection Criteria section.
Comment 2: I think it is better to remove some of the studies on space closure and anchorage loss from the introduction and talk about the important ones in the discussion.
Response: We have removed some of the studies on space closure and anchorage loss from the introduction and talk about the important ones in the discussion.