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Author’s response to reviews:

Reviewer #1:

==============

Abstract: page 2, line 35 revise " experimental sid"

Response: This error was corrected

Key words: MeSH terms must be used, please correct.

Response: MeSh terms were inserted among the current keywords.


Response: This reference was added.

Introduction page 5 , line 42: the typing error must be deleted.
Response: The typing error was deleted.

Material and methods page 6, line 39-50: the post-surgical medical therapy is confusionally described; must be re-written.

Response: The post-surgical medical therapy was re-written properly.

Page 7, line 4: surgical scalpel blade N. 15.

Response: This comment was added to the manuscript.

It is unclear how the measurements on plaster models have been performed: the method must be described. What is the reference of Ziegler and Ingervall?

Response: The method was clarified in detail and the relevant reference was added to the reference list.

Statistical Analysis: must be rewritten. In particular the method error should be better described (reproducibility and reliability).

Response: The section 'method error' was re-written properly.

Results: page 9 line 4 (1 patient in each group).

Response: This addition was inserted into the text.

Discussion: Page 11 lines 43-58, page 12 lines 20-35: must be eliminated because the study of Leethanakul is not comparable.

Response: Deletion was made according to the reviewer's suggestion.

The figures 1, 3, 5 must be removed.

Response: Figures 1 and 3 were removed and the rest of the figures were re-numbered. However, we could not delete Figure no 5 (which became Figure 3) because we thought that it would beneficial to the reader to see the full picture of the procedure in the experimental sides when the canines were being retracted using a coil spring following the surgical interventions.
The reference 6 is non-existent;


In the reference 11 there is a typing error.

Response: This typing error was corrected.

Reviewer #2: Thank you for submitting this very interesting paper.

It is well constructed and the science is well conducted and described. However, there are very, many problems, mainly to do with the poor English.

The manuscript was reviewed by a native English language speaker and several modifications were made to strengthen this manuscript.

Also, there are some unexplained acronyms, for example, PROPEL

Response: PROPEL was clarified in the List of abbreviations paragraph on page 13.

Before considering it further, the English needs to be checked by a professional service. When this has been done, please re-submit it.

Response: The English language of this manuscript was reviewed and the current submission is expected to meet the requirements.

Reviewer #3:

Authors present a study comparing retraction methods of canines. The authors seem to have done a well-made trial.

Some issues that can be addressed are the measurement error of all the distances and angles measured is missing, this is important to have to see the real impact of change

Response: The error of the method was clarified in detail. The relevant section was re-written properly to deliver the information to the reader in a clear format. The results of the analysis
regarding 'method error' were also given in detail and three Supplementary Tables were provided. I am not sure if the reviewer had been given the opportunity to see these three tables. Supplementary Table 1 gives the information regarding the systematic error analysis. Supplementary Table 2 gives the information regarding the random error analysis. Supplementary Table 3 gives the information regarding the Bland and Altman analysis of the levels of agreement between repeated measurements.

Was there any blinding when measuring the models? This is important because it can incorporate a huge bias.

Response: Yes, the principal researcher who analyzed the models was blinded. This has been mentioned in page 5: ‘Therefore, blinding was applied only for outcomes’ assessor’.

Please also be advice that your manuscript must be edited by a professional proofreading service.

Response: The manuscript was reviewed by a native English language speaker and was improved.

I hope that the current shape and content of our submission would meet your satisfaction as well as the satisfaction of your respectable reviewers.