Dear Editors and Reviewers:

Thank you for your letter and the referee’s comments concerning our manuscript entitled “Modified orthodontic treatment Substitution of canines by first premolars: a case report”. Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper. We have studied their comments carefully and have made correction which we hope meet with their approval.

Responds to the reviewer’s comments:

1. It is not clear from the Abstract what was the aim of the study. Overall Abstract should be modified, since in this form it cannot stand alone. Authors should highlight all important information which will give a full impression for a reader what was done and what is the results/outcomes/conclusion of the report.
   Answers: We have modified the abstract, to emphasize what was the aim of the study.

2. In my view some additional, relevant keywords should be added.
   Answers: Two more relevant keywords have been added.

3. Citations in the text should start from [1] and continue [2,3…etc..]. You started the text with the reference [14,15]. Please revise and keep citations in an acceptable manner.
   Answers: We adjusted all citations in an acceptable manner.

4. Please rewrite the following sentence for further clearance “The position at the middle corner of the dental arch cannot be injured easily”.
   Answers: We have rewritten the following sentence “The position at the middle corner of the dental arch cannot be injured easily” in an appropriate grammar.

5. The introduction should be revised. Authors should present the background of the study (what is known), after that authors should present what is unknown (what was the gap in the science). Based on that authors should highlight the aim of their study.
   Answers: The introduction has been revised, highlighting the aim of our study.

6. “Diagnosis and etiology” heading does not fit with the information presented under this heading. Maybe it will be better to change as “Patient examination and diagnosis”.
   Answers: “Diagnosis and etiology” have been changed to “Patient examination and diagnosis”

7. I could not understand what is the D6, B6: Which classification is this. In my view authors should use any acceptable tooth classification, otherwise this classification is not well known and cannot be understood by the reader.
   Answers: tooth classification has been changed.


9. All abbreviations should be opened when appear in the text for the first time.
Answers: A abbreviation has been opened.

10. Some key references are missing in the Discussion section.
Answers: We added some references that referee recommended.


12. Authors should modify a conclusion a little and write some strong conclusion. They should highlight what can be learned from this case.
Answers: We modify the conclusion and write some strong conclusions to highlight the clinical significance.

Thank you very much for your comments and suggestions again.