

Answers to reviewers

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade C (A great deal of language polishing)

The complete document had a linguistic polishing.

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors: The author very briefly reviewed some of the literature and made an empirical conclusion which may not be valid or useful. For example, why the total energy recommended is 2.2 J per surface? Because was reported in 2010 and the reference is in the manuscript.

Why wavelength is 810nm and not 780nm or 800nm? I suggest a major revision is needed before this manuscript could be reconsidered for publication

Because one systematic review reported the effective range 780 and 830

8. Domínguez Camacho A, Montoya Guzmán D, Velásquez Cujar SA. Effective Wavelength Range in Photobiomodulation for Tooth Movement Acceleration in Orthodontics: A Systematic Review. *Photobiomodul Photomed Laser Surg* 2020 ;**38**:581-590 [PMID: 32609566 [DOI: [10.1089/photob.2020.4814](https://doi.org/10.1089/photob.2020.4814)]

And the last meta analysis reported 810nm as the effective wavelength:

9. Grajales M, Ríos-Orsorio N, Jimenez-Peña O, Mendez-Sanchez J, Sanchez-Fajardo K, García-Perdomo HA. Effectiveness of photobiomodulation with low-level lasers on the acceleration of orthodontic tooth movement: a systematic review and meta-analysis of split-mouth randomized clinical trials. *Lasers Med Sci* 2023;**38**:200[PMID: 37667064 DOI: [10.1007/s10103-023-03870-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10103-023-03870-7)]

(1) Science editor:

(1) Please supplement references from the past five years. (2) Please refer to more original clinical studies.

I added 10 more references from the past 5 years.