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Reviewer's report:

Dear Sir,

Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper.

My overall comment for the manuscript is the following:

Authors have considerably improved their manuscript.

Few minor changes are still needed before it can be completely approved on my side.

- **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?**
   
   Authors have changed the text according to the suggestions. Please see Introduction section related Comments for a minor change and also the Materials and Methods suggestion section for a brief comment to add.

2. **Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?**
   
   Authors have implemented Materials and Methods section. Relating to the clarifications made this reviewer suggests a very brief comment to be made in the Introduction section. Please see Materials and Methods section related comments.

3. **Are the data sound and well controlled?**
   
   Clinical data seem to be sound, changes operated are satisfactory

   See Results section related comments for further suggested changes.

4. **Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data**
deposition?
Presentation of data is now satisfactory
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
Section is now satisfactory
6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Changes made are satisfactory
7. Is the writing acceptable?
Acceptable
Specific Comments:
Introduction
Page 3 line 50 “In contract” is probably “In contrast”
Methods
The Authors have now expanded the section and it is now clear that they have used “Human corticocancellous mineralized allograft bone” (line 81, page 4) as a grafting material, please add in the introduction a very brief mention of the use of such material as a grafting material in sinus lift procedures
Please see also the following reference, already indicated in the first review of the manuscript:
Sbordone C, Toti P, Guidetti F, Califano L, Pannone G, Sbordone L
Volumetric changes after sinus augmentation using blocks of autogenous iliac bone or freeze-dried allogeneic bone. A non-randomized study
J Cranio Maxillofacial Surg 42(2): 113–118; 2014
Results:
Page 5 line 109 “sinusitis.(Table) 3 of the 4”. Please position the full mark and the capital letter appropriately.
Page 5 line 113 “In the 2 who did not, 1 patient underwent implant ejection due to”
Probably better “1 patient lost an implant due …”
References:
The correct reference at #24 (page 12 line 271) is:
- Sbordone C, Toti P, Guidetti F, Califano L, Bufo P, Sbordone L
Volume Changes of Autogenous Bone after Sinus Lifting and Grafting Procedures: A 6-year Computerized Tomographic Follow-up
J Cranio Maxillofacial Surg 41: 235-241; 2013
And not the one reported that is a copy of the reference #5
Correct title for reference # 25 (page 12 line 274) is:
Martuscelli R, Toti P, Sbordone L, Guidetti F, Ramaglia L, Sbordone C.
Five-year outcome of bone remodelling around implants in the maxillary sinus: assessment of differences between implants placed in autogenous inlay bone blocks and in ungrafted maxilla.

Thank you very much for your attention.
Best regards
Prof. Ranieri Martuscelli, MD DDS
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