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Reviewer's report:

This is a very interesting clinical report that clearly shows how orthodontic treatment can contribute in the improvement of gingival recessions that occur due to undesirable torque movement of teeth. However, there are certain revisions that will considerably improve the present report. Please find my detailed comments below:

1. A report of 3 patients cannot be considered a clinical study, but a case report/series. Of course, the authors present it as a pilot study, but no reason for this is provided (pilot for what?). In any case, 3 patients are not enough even for a pilot study. Thus, I suggest that the authors change all parts of the manuscript that describe this report as a clinical study to a case report or case series.

2. Based on the same considerations, I would remove the part of statistical analysis (text in Methods and p-value on Table 3). No stats are possible on three patients. The authors should just report their findings descriptively, as they nicely do, without any statistics.

3. A further consideration could be that no method error was performed (double measurements) and there was no blinding. However, since this is a case report, I leave this to the authors' willing.

Abstract

4. "Introduction: Aim of this study was to analyze the efficacy…"

Please rephrase to: "Introduction: Aim of this report was to evaluate the efficacy…"

5. "Materials and Methods: …Plaster casts before and after treatment and plaster casts of the set up and final model were scanned and superimposed…"

Please delete: "…and final model …". I guess this is the model after treatment, which is already reported.

6. "Results: …gingival recession were reduced of 1.1 mm…" Please replace "of" with "by" and "recession" with "recessions".
Background

7. Page 1. Lines 9-15. "It could be demonstrated…" Please rephrase to: It was demonstrated. Also change to "…A previous study showed…"


9. Page 1. Line 33. "…they are partially debonded unnoticed by the patient…” Please change to "…debonded and unnoticed…”

10. Page 1. Lines 44-50. Ref (12) refers to teeth with endodontic problems that previously had caries. I would suggest to remove this paragraph together with the reference.

Methods

11. Page 5. Lines 35-39. Why these points were chosen? It would be nice to have also points on teeth adjacent to the torqued teeth to show if and how they were changed.

12. Page 5. Lines 46-46. Please describe how exactly these measurements were performed. From which point to which.

Results


14. I would remove Tables 1, 4, and 5 and report these findings as text in the manuscript.

Discussion


16. Page 8. Line 55. "A big advantage of this method is that orthopantomogramms…” Please change to "Orthopantomogramms…”". This cannot be considered advantage of the method. It is just an incidence.

17. Page 9. Line 57. Please add the number of the Ref. after the name "[19]".

18. Page 10. Line 12. "…studies are desirable to prove this possible advantage." Please rephrase to: "…studies are needed to confirm this possible advantage."
Figures

19. I would make one figure out of figures 2 and 4, showing all the three cases. The reference teeth used for superimposition in each case should be reported and ideally appear green (unchanged) in the images.

20. Please do as above also for Figure 5.

21. Please explain what are the white areas on teeth, shown in Figs 2, 4, and 5.
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