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REVIEWER COMMENTS FROM REPORT: Overall the study is nice while there are concerns regarding the research quality of the manuscript besides the loop holes in the presentation of the manuscript too.

The study is a meta-analysis and a systematic review which is a statistical analysis that combines the results of multiple scientific studies.

The study lacks a pertinent PROTOCOL DEVELOPMENT. In other words, The authors must mention that the review employs the PRISMA statement (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analyses).

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. Exclusion and Selection criteria must be more furnished, clear and reliable.

Please mention clearly how many authors screened the articles. Further, what was done if there was any conflict while screening? Were the investigators who screened the articles calibrated? Kindly mention this in the text.

There is no mention about the risk of Bias in this meta-analysis. Please mention this as this is an important aspect.

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.
REQUESTED REVISIONS:

There are various things to consider regarding the methodology about meta-analysis which are not considered by the authors. The detailed description is mentioned in the section above. Basically the research question is not designed with detail and the screening authors doesn't seem to be calibrated. This may lead to bias which will make the evaluations meaningless. Kindly rectify.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

The abstract is not a good presentation of the potential of the manuscript. Revise it. Even the introduction section must be more elaborate. There are various grammatical and sentence forming errors too.

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.

No

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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