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Dear Editor-In-Chief,
We would like to thank Dr. Martuscelli for his comments, and apologize for the oversight regarding the incomplete revision. It was a communication error on our part, and we have immediately incorporated all of the changes which Dr. Martuscelli has suggested. We would be more than happy to have him be the reviewer for the final version of the manuscript. Our response to his suggestions are underlined below.

Reviewer's report
Title: A retrospective analysis of the relationship between rhinosinusitis and sinus lift dental implantation
Version: 3
Date: 23 October 2014
Reviewer: Ranieri Martuscelli
Reviewer's report:
Dear Sir,
Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper.
My overall comment for the manuscript is the following:
Authors failed to complete the suggested changes, it would be easy to complete the suggested revision, just cut and paste the suggestions. Few minor changes already suggested twice and not completed are still needed before the manuscript can be approved on my side. Authors considered only some of the suggestions for text revision. Please see again Discussion and Reference section related Comments for the minor suggested changes.
• Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
I will be happy to serve as a reviewer also for the revised version if you decide so.
The Authors should outline changes in color (for example in yellow) to facilitate tracking of the changes.
Here follow requested assessments related to the specific points and specific comments related to the sections of the manuscript that I hope may assist the Authors in the revision process:
1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined?  
   ok
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?
Authors have implemented Materials and Methods section.
3. Are the data sound and well controlled?
Clinical data seem to be sound
See Results section related comments for the missing text revision.
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
Presentation of data is satisfactory
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
Section is satisfactory
6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Satisfactory
7. Is the writing acceptable?
Acceptable

Specific Comments:

Results:

Page 5 line 110 “2 of the 4 patients also had ipsilateral ethmoid sinusitis (Table.) 3 of the 4 patients had suffered from purulent...” Would rather be: “Two of the 4 patients also had ipsilateral ethmoid sinusitis (Table.) 3 of the 4 patients had suffered from purulent...” then please insert the number of the Table

We agree and have made the suggested change.

Page 5 line 116 “…the other was given a additional 10-day…”
Correct sentence would be: “…the other was given an additional 10-day…”
We agree and have made the suggested change.

References:

Reference #5 (page 11 line 224-226) related to the use of freeze-dried allogeneic bone is the following and not the one reported now at #5 so please replace it with the following:

We agree and have made the suggested change.

The correct title for reference # 25 (page 12 line 277) is the following so please replace the actual with the following:

We agree and have made the suggested change.

Thank you very much for your attention.
Best regards
Prof. Ranieri Martuscelli, MD DDS
Level of interest:
An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English:
Acceptable
Statistical review:
No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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