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Reviewer’s report:

The manuscript titled "The influence of bracket type on the external apical root resorption in class I extraction patients - a retrospective study" has a profile for this periodical and I recommend the publication after making minor corrections in several points of the text.

Abstract

Minor correction in summary introduction:

Background: The relationship between orthodontic treatment-related factors and external apical root resorption (EARR) has never been fully answered. The aim of this study was to investigate whether conventional and passive self-ligating brackets affect the amount and severity of EARR in withdrawal patients.

Conclusions: The type of bracket did not influence the occurrence and severity of the external apical root resorption in class I extraction patients.

Material and methods

1- Invert the arrangement of figures 1 and 2 in the text.

2 - Insert in the reference session the two citations described in figure 2

3 - The caption of figure 1 is ineligible.

4- Quote the reference of Dahlberg's formula

Results

1- Formatting the captions of all tables

2- Correct the caption from table 7
3- In table 7, what is the meaning of the abbreviations SE and b

4- In table 7, explain the meaning of the overwritten signal in the word multivariate model

Discussion

We all know that patients with tooth extraction are more prone to root resorption than those without tooth extraction (cite references).

Furthermore, we recruited more patients than previous studies (which studies?)

This study only included maxillary incisors because maxillary incisors were most susceptible to root resorption during orthodontic treatment (cite references).

Compared with conventional brackets, it has been hypothesized that fast tooth movement in self-ligating brackets will result in more EARR during the orthodontic treatment (cite references).

Light forces have long been recommended to reduce adverse tissue reactions (root resorption). (cite references).

Some deficiencies still need to draw our attention. First, the panoramic radiographs is not precise than periapical radiographs or CBCT for measuring EARR. (cite references).

However, taking into account that the radiation dose of the periapical radiographs or CBCT is larger, and many studies have confirmed that it is possible to use a panoramic film to initially determine the amount of root absorption (cite references).
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
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Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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