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Reviewer's report:

Interesting paper showing negative results according previous publications, which is quite rare nowadays in scientific scenario.

Data came from a Korean health care databank, following a common way to explore controversial clinical hypothesis, to accept or denied itself.

Eligibility criteria and study designed are clever, but the criteria to define the severity of research trial morbidity (chronic periodontitis - CP) is based in treatment procedures and not the one accepted in clinical manners.

The authors justified this option because the databank did not contain this precise information.

The chosen tools to diagnose CP severity are also clever but could underestimate worse cases, which impacts in the characteristics of participants according to periodontitis severity: 69.9% healthy participants, with only 17% with severe disease.

I wonder this discrepancy could avoid the results usually showed in clinical trials with a very small number of participants, linking CP with pneumonia, especially because clinical studies explained that CP is attributed to severe or atypical hospital and community acquired pneumonia. Considering that authors chose to look only for community acquired pneumonia, the study could have to different bias leading to no significant results.
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