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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Professor Stamm,

Thank you for the opportunity to resubmit our paper formerly entitled "Single tooth torque correction in the lower frontal area by a completely customized lingual appliance".

We want to thank the reviewers as well for the positive and constructive feedback and took all aspects mentioned by the reviewers into account and made changes to our paper. All changes are marked yellow in the paper itself and in the cover letter.

Yours sincerely

Collin Jacobs

Reply to reviewer #2

1. Concern of the reviewer: This is a very interesting clinical report that has been considerably improved after the revision. However, there are a few more revisions that will further improve the present report. Please find my detailed comments below:
In Background the following has been added: "The force of the results of this study is of course strongly limited due to the small amount of only three patients. But this pilot study shows that the digital superposition is a very well feasible method to analyze the planned and reached tooth position done by a partial appliance."

This whole part should be removed. This case series does not test the validity, accuracy, precision, or even reproducibility of the superimposition technique. Thus, one cannot suggest the method as "novel" because he simply tried to implement it and created some "nice" images. For this reason, I would remove this text and also the pilot study from the abstract and the test. A pilot study should be a pilot for a reason and should also be a study. With 3 patients this is definitely a case report/series.

Our response: We removed that whole part from the manuscript.

2. Concern of the reviewer: Background line 9: "It was be demonstrated…" Please rephrase to "It was demonstrated…"

Revised text: It was demonstrated…

3. Page 5. Line 57 "…boarder" should be "…border…"

Revised text: border

Reviewer #3: The article has gained in clarity with the author's responses. 

Some details would be appreciated regarding the periodontal surgeries that were performed on two of the three patients (timing and type).

Our response: Thank you very much for that interesting question. Only in one patient periodontal surgery was performed. This was done after the orthodontic treatment. Pictures and plaster casts, which are shown and measured in this study, were all done after orthodontic treatment without periodontal surgery.

Furthermore, I would suggest some english editing to enhance the quality of reading.

Our response: Thank you very much for that advice. We performed a further language and spelling check.
Again we thank all reviewers for the innovative proposals, which helped a lot to improve our manuscript.

On behalf of the authors