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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor, BMC Oral Health

I hope that by editing the comments I have improved the quality of the manuscript. Please find the modification in color.

Authors have invited to critically revise the manuscript another master in implant dentistry. Dr. Błaszczyszyn has been added to the author list. His contribution was a critical revision and final correction of the manuscript

Reviewer 2 ER:

Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution?

Yes

Reviewer comments: The authors have revised the manuscript adequately. However, there are still some concerns which are not addressed.
1. The Objective and the conclusion in the abstract are not in resonance.

When the objective of the study is ""The objective of this study was to compare survival rates and marginal bone loss as well as assess the degree of stability of Straumann SLActive® and Thomenn Incell® implants with a superhydrophilic surface"", the conclusion must be regarding the survival rates, marginal bone loss as well as degree of stability only.

The cannot write that ""Both systems, Thommen Inicell and Straumann SLActive, offer a reasonable and predictable alternative for dentists looking to shorten the duration of implant-prosthetic treatment for their patients.""

The authors have changed the conclusion in the abstract:

Conclusion

The systems we investigated, i.e. Thommen Inicell and Straumann SLActive, demonstrated a high survival rate, a high level of implant stability and low marginal bone loss.

And in the manuscript

CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis and the implant placement success criteria devised by Buser et al. [52], according to which implant-prosthetic treatment is deemed to be successful when the implant – during functional loading – produces no pain or any kind of discomfort, there are no signs of inflammation, infection or implant mobility, and a radiological examination shows no low density bone structure foci around the implant or recurrent bone loss we can state that both systems, Thommen Inicell and Straumann SLActive, help shorten the time of implant-prosthetic treatment while ensuring a high survival rate, good implant stability and low marginal bone loss.

Few of the queries of last time have not been addressed at all.

Those were:

Further, the authors need to indicate whether any detailed protocol was designed to answer the research questions? (There are methods like the PICO system for such things. The authors have not mentioned clearly in the text in the material and method section that implants of which site were considered. Please mention about the ethnic origin of the articles too, if possible. (With ethnic origin, I mean to say that the geographical origin of the research of the articles considered).}
Authors have added the PICO description in the test

The studies described in the papers were not analyzed with regard to the influence of ethnic factors and their impact on the research results, because the authors did not adopt such criteria and data of this type were not presented.

The topic of the research in the analyzed articles had to be either Straumann SLActive® implants or Thommen Incell® implants.

The authors based their search strategy on the PICO model (Problem, Intervention(s), Comparison, Outcome).

Problem:
A comparison of survival rates and marginal bone loss as well as an assessment of the degree of stability of dental implants with superhydrophilic surfaces - Straumann SLAactive® and Thomenn Incell® implants.

Intervention;
The articles searched on the PubMed/MEDLINE internet database were selected on the basis of the established criteria.

Comparison:
A comparison and analysis of the results described in the selected studies.

Outcome:
An assessment of the results

In the first phase of the study the authors analysed titles and abstracts with the aim of assessing whether the material contained in them meets the conditions for further analysis. The selection criteria described below were applied.

Exclusion and Selection criteria are elaborated but still must be more furnished, and reliable.

Selection criteria

• Prospective clinical studies on patients fitted with Straumann SLActive® or Thommen Incell® implants, or with both these systems

• Studies which describe both the criteria of success and failure
• No surgical techniques, types of restoration, age, sex, etc. were distinguished

Exclusion criteria
• Animal Studies
• Studies describing the placement of >= 10 implants
• Studies in which the follow-up time for a prosthetic restoration was less than 6 months
• Retrospective studies
• Publications of case series and case reports
• Short communications

The following comment is also not addressed at all:

The authors have mentioned that the articles were removed depending upon their suitability and at the end after full text reading, only 20 articles were considered. Please mention in detail the reasons at each stage for the exclusion of the articles. Mention these reasons in the text as well as in the flow chart of Fig 1.

The detail description is now in the manuscript.

Thommen

Articles found in databases .............................................................178
Articles excluded on the basis of the title ........................................63
Articles selected on the basis of the title .................................115
Articles excluded after reading the summary ............................104
Articles selected after reading the summary ...............................11
Articles excluded after reading the full text ..............................3
Articles selected after reading the full text ..............................8
Straumann

Articles found in databases .........................................................1052
Articles excluded on the basis of the title ....................................936
Articles selected on the basis of the title ......................................116
Articles excluded after reading the summary ..............................84
Articles selected after reading the summary .................................27
Articles excluded after reading the full text ...............................16
Articles selected after reading the full text .................................12

Total: Thommen and Straumann

Articles found in databases .........................................................1230
Articles excluded on the basis of the title ....................................999
Articles selected on the basis of the title ......................................231
Articles excluded after reading the summary ..............................188
Articles selected after reading the summary .................................38
Articles excluded after reading the full text ...............................19
Articles selected after reading the full text .................................20