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Reviewer's report:

First of all, the topic is very interesting and the testing procedure is appropriate. However, the authors investigated one sample per scaffold group for all assays. Even as a pilot study, it is difficult to conclude something from one specimen. For example, when looking at Figure 3, MG63+ring (without scaffold) showed varied results between the groups. This means MG63 cell culture condition itself is always different for each assay. Then the combined data from all groups (Figure 4) cannot be meaningful. Also, there is a big gap of the data between cell viability test and cell number test. However the authors concluded that any uniform trend could not be found between the groups and all the scaffolds possess potential of good cell proliferation. I recommend the sample number should be increased at least for cell viability assay and cell count assay to lead the conclusion.

In addition, the author tested cell viability, cell number and pH values at 2, 3, and 4 days after cell-seeding. Is there any reason why the authors didn't measure cell viability and cell number at day 1?

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
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