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Reviewer's report:

A comparison of mandibular and maxillary alveolar osteogenesis over six weeks: a radiographical examination

General comment

The submitted article presents a study on the alveolar bone density changes compared between the maxilla and the mandible following the creation of similar defects in Cacma baboons.

The general idea and its realization are interesting and need our attention.

Nevertheless, the submitted publication needs some specifications regarding the different sections as described below.

Methods and Results

This section is somewhat too short even though you refer to in detail on your publication of 2012 (Kotze et al.). I think that most of the readers do not have this publication immediately next to them.

Some specifications regarding:

1.) One or several surgeons, examiners? Name the person in the text.
2.) Radiographic procedure: Digital or analogue? Unit?
3.) Describe the animals (age, sex, weight etc.). Those are variables that could have an impact of your measurements on bone density.
4.) Radiographic analysis: The standardization process could be described better.
5.) Statistical analysis: We have no analysis of variables regarding the animals. Is there any reason why? Does age, sex, weight or the examiner etc. have any influence on the outcomes?
6.) Error of the method?
7.) Could you describe better to the reader what the abbreviations “F” and “t” mean in the text and the table?

Discussion
8.) Do you have any suggestion for future research to make any improvements?

Finally, the submitted paper is based on a good idea and is interesting. I propose to have it published in the head & Face Medicine after those revisions.
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