

Response to the Reviewer 3 Comments

We would like to express our sincere gratitude to Reviewers for the comments, suggestions, and corrections. We carefully analyzed all reviewers' questions and tried our best to improve the manuscript taking into account the issued comments and recommendations. We feel that our manuscript improved and is now more complete. Below is a detailed response to the reviewer's comments:

Reviewer#3

The paper entitled "Bonding Behaviour of Orthodontic Brackets Under Cycling Loading" is an interesting contribute that evaluate mechanical bonding behaviour of different orthodontic bracket types and bonding agents under cycling loading.

We appreciate and agree with reviewer's comment. We think that our study was not an interesting contribution to the scientific world, but a method in which the bonding strength of orthodontic brackets was evaluated with a novel approach and would be the basis for further studies.

However, some corrections are needed before the paper can be considered suitable for publication.

We thank so much to reviewer's worthy elaboration. We tried to do all the improvements and corrections as recommended with care.

Introduction

Introduction section is too brief, it highlights only the more general characteristics of the adhesion of the orthodontic bracket. The various factors that may affect this adhesion are not mentioned, nor those related to the characteristics of the bracket, nor those that depend on the adhesive technique. The bibliography is relevant, however this section must be largely revised.

We are very grateful to the reviewer's worthy evaluation.

In line 29-48; we improved the introduction by adding more informative and explanatory information in line with your suggestion. As pointed out, we mentioned a wide variety of factors that affect the bonding strength of orthodontic brackets. In this context, we realized that with the addition of the suggested improvements, the manuscript became more understandable and appropriate for purpose.

In line 333-437; thanks to the suggested improvements, current references were added to the bibliography and the development of this section was provided.

Material and Methods

Material and methods section is reported in a clear and detailed manner. All the different steps of the study are described analytically and are easily understood by the reader. In the present study only metallic and ceramic brackets were tested, for which reason sapphire brackets have not been evaluated, considering their extensive use in the clinical practice. Authors must also clarify which type of brackets were tested, whether incisors, canines or premolars.

We would like to express our gratitude to the reviewer for valuable comments and opinions. We paid great attention to the writing of our manuscript in a readable and understandable language. In this study, we wanted to test metal and ceramic brackets, which were widely used in orthodontics clinics.

In line 64,75; as suggested we specified in the relevant lines that we used upper premolar teeth brackets in the study.

Results

The results of the study are overall well represented also from an iconographic point of view. The statistical analysis was carried out correctly and allows a reliable evaluation of the results obtained; the representation in the table of the statistical data is more clear and analytical

We would like to thank the reviewer for valuable assessment of the results of our study. We tried to express the results we obtained during laboratory tests and statistical analysis in the best way. We took attention to write our manuscript in a way that even non-orthodontist dentists could understand.

Discussion

The literature analysis reported in the discussion section is too extensive, it is necessary to review this part of the work and better analyze the data from the work.

We thank so much to reviewer's care. It was inevitable that the discussion section was extensive because of the used of 10 different types of brackets and 300 samples. We were so eager to express all the statistically significant data we obtained. However, as we thought that this would keep the discussion section very comprehensive, we tried to express only the results that we thought to be statistically and clinically significant in a simple and understandable language.