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PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS: To view the full report from the academic peer reviewer, please see the attached file.

REVIEWER COMMENTS FROM REPORT: Overall the study is a nice script as for as the objectives are concerned. But there are several spelling mistakes as well as sentence forming errors. Further the introduction can be more detailed and effective. Inclusion and Exclusion criteria is incomplete. Authors have missed Root canal teeth, prosthesis etc. In the exclusion criteria the authors have written "systematic diseases". I think it should be systemic diseases. Further it will be better if the authors elaborate on the systemic diseases. Since there is the effect of duration of the therapy on EARR, what about the patients who are non-compliant and the duration of orthodontic treatment was lingered or prolonged due to frequent breakage of the brackets? Highlight that the cases were not a re-treatment case. Please include this fact in the criteria too. Was there any case in which radiograph was not of good quality and hence it was difficult to measure the EARR.

Since it is a retrospective study, how was the sample size decided and at what significance level.

Details of the measurement method are required in the manuscript. What tool was used for measurement and what was the accuracy of the tool.

There is no way that distortion will not happen in the radiography. What was the reliability of the method used. Else there will be false misleading results of the study. Was there any formula used to measure EARR?

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

Material and Method section requires modification. I have mentioned it in the section above.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

Spelling mistakes and sentence forming errors are there.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?  
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?  
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?  
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?  
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English  
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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