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Reviewer's report:

The authors of the article "Incorrect measurements and misleading conclusions in the article "Comparison of the efficacy of tooth alignment among lingual and labial brackets: an in vitro study" revised an article recently published by Alobeid et al on EJO in 2018.

Wiechmann et al analyzed introduction, material and method and results and they highlighted many critical points. The most interesting points are the repeatability of the experimental tests and the real ability of the OMSS system to reproduce the tooth movement. Personally, the criticisms are reasonable and can be shared since Alobeid et al showed no repeatability test to demonstrate the reliability of their method. For these reasons, the conclusions of Wiechmann et al are well-founded: no conclusion on real teeth movement can be drawn on the basis of a hardly repeatable in vitro test on a single case. I would suggest only some minor changes in two different points of the article.

In the line 5 of the section background after "previously removed" the comma should be removed.

In the lines 9-10 the authors described the results of their tests, but they should specify how long they observed the arch wire behavior.
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