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Reviewer's report:

1. Limitations of the study are not clearly stated.
2. The Background could be condensed; some information is already well known, that is, biofilms will respond differently from planktonic cells, coating and uncoating with saliva will result in different outcomes, etc.
3. About the fresh isolate from a peri-implant infection site, was this also from one of the researchers? Was the peri-implantitis site from a patient that lost the implant? Please revise, this was not clear throughout the text.
4. Ethical aspect of this manuscript. Although the authors state that “the saliva was collected from ourselves (the authors) and our research colleagues rather than from patients”, I do agree that the collection is completely non-invasive but this should not deter the authors of Ethical approval. Insert a sentence stating that the Faculty of Odontology has approved this experiment, especially considering the “fresh clinical isolate of S. oralis (89C) from a peri-implant infection site” collected.
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