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**Reviewer’s report:**

The authors present their experience of using Medpor in facial reconstruction in a total of 56 patients. They report only one reconstruction failure and otherwise excellent cosmetic outcome. The rather short time clinical outcome (3 months) was uneventful and none of the patients experience an operative infect. Based on their experience and the result of their study the authors conclude that Medpor is superior to previous reconstruction techniques using autologous materials.

There are important issues that need to be addressed:

1. In the abstract section the authors mention that the presented study is a cross sectional study, however they do not specify this in the section “Methods and Materials”. It is of interest in which time frame the patients were recruited for the study.

2. What where the parameters that the authors collected from the patient charts?

3. I assume that there was written inform consent in all cases. This should be stated in the Para-graph on Ethical Approval. Is there any ethic committee approval number?

4. How did the author judge for the cosmetic outcome “excellent” (VAS visual analog score?; patient and surgeons view?)

5. The manuscript needs language corrections.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.