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Reviewer's report:

Some comments on the background and form

1. Presentation of VAS tables
   They are relatively confused.

   Since you are doing a study on different periods, it would be useful to have an analysis at 14, 28 days (Appendix absent, I am mistaken) because the active group requires a longer healing process.

   Which raises the question of the point date of your study. A summary chart would make reading easier

   Which could lead you to a multifactorial type analysis applied to VAS 'case vs.. control'

2. Choice of VAS

   The literature recommends an odd number of values. You have taken the option of a variable from 0 to 100. Can you explain this choice? Would not it make sense to create categories of value judgments (0-4) and thus allow a synthesized visibility and a more efficient analysis.

   Did you use CI or SE? Why?

   Are you sure of the relevance of the choice of the X2 test with regard to the small number of people?

3. Are there other criteria for judgment than others involved in VAS (bleeding, smoking, etc....?)

4. Not sure that clinical photography is of interest

5. Unless I am mistaken, appendix II only targeted the active group. If so, my advice is to remove it
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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.

Yes

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.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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