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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear editor Chalisa Iamsrithong,

Thank you for your letter and for the reviewers comments concerning our manuscript entitled “The influence of bracket type on the external apical root resorption in class I extraction patients - a retrospective study”. (ID: OHEA-D-18-00219R1). Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our researches. We have studied comments carefully and have made correction which we hope meet with approval. The main corrections in the paper and the responds to the reviewer’s comments are as flowing:

Responds to the Technical Comments:

1. Please include the email addresses for all authors on the title page. The corresponding author should still be indicated.

Respond: I have added the email addresses for all authors on the title page.

2. Figure files should contain only the image, as well as any associated keys/annotations. If legends are present within the figure files, please remove them.

Respond: I have revised according to your suggestion that figure files should contain only the image.

3. Please provide figure legends under a separate heading of 'Figure Legends' after the References. If Figure titles/legends are within the main text of the manuscript or the figure files, please move them.
Respond: I have revised according to your suggestion. We added figure legends under a separate heading of 'Figure Legends' after the References.

4. At this stage, please upload your manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colours. All relevant tables/figures/additional files should also be clean versions. Figures (and additional files) should remain uploaded as separate files.

Respond: I have revised according to your suggestion.

Responds to the reviewers’ Comments:

Janir Soares (Reviewer 1): Thank you for the corrections made in the manuscript and I consider it appropriate for publication.

Respond: Special thanks to you for your good comments.

Reviewer 2 (Reviewer 2): REVISION ASSESSMENT FROM THE ACADEMIC PEER REVIEWER:

Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? Yes

Reviewer comments: All the changes have been made. But the manuscript is still filled with grammatical and sentence forming errors. Please get it corrected, else it will not be good for the international readership.

Respond: Thank you for your kindly suggestion. We have invited a English-native professor carefully revised the grammatical and sentence forming errors.

We tried our best to improve the manuscript and made some changes in the manuscript. We appreciate for Editors/Reviewers warm work earnestly, and hope that the correction will meet with approval.

Once again, thank you very much for your comments and suggestions.

Thank you and best regards.

Yours sincerely,
Corresponding author: Zhou Yu