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Reviewer's report:

The authors conducted a review, aiming to compare the early wound healing after regenerative periodontal surgery with either EMD or GTR treatment. The topic is clinically relevant. However, Conclusion was not made solidly based on the data analysis but just with a descriptive analysis. I suggest performing subgroup analysis to distinguish various defect type instead of making an assumptive conclusion.

Background

1. lines 122-123: "The use of EMD on the other hand, has been described to have a positive effect on early wound healing." How was this statement made? Did you infer that GTR may not have positive effect on early wound healing?

2. lines 131-132: The definition of null hypothesis should be "no difference" between the two interventions. Please correct this statement based on the definition of null hypothesis.

3. line 128: "Adjunct"? Did you compare GTR vs. EMD or GTR vs. GTR+EMD? If you compared the former one, then the EMD is not considered an adjunct.

Methods

1. lines 155: How about light smokers? Were they also excluded?

Results

1. line 219: How about the reviewers' agreement on "full text" review?

2. I will suggest to report the funding sources of each included study since the source of finding may potentially bias the publication outcomes.
Discussion

1. I will suggest to distinguish different type of defects for subgroup discussion, i.e. furcation defect vs. contained defect vs. non-contained defect, since each type of defect is a different entity.

2. I will suggest to compare GTR vs. EMD (monotherapy), and GTR vs. GTR+EMD(adjunct) since these two can be totally different subgroup comparisons.

3. Your conclusion is solely based on ePTFE membrane. Please state this in your conclusion since nowadays most of the GTR will be done with collagen membranes but not ePTFE membrane.

4. Please comment on the use of dPTFE or collagen membranes on the GTR outcome, since ePTFE is not commonly used for GTR anymore.

5. lines 600-602: how did you define "early wound healing"?

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