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Reviewer's report:

"REVISION ASSESSMENT FROM THE ACADEMIC PEER REVIEWER:

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 SLAactive® 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 can not write that ""Both systems, Thommen Incell and Straumann SLAActive, offer a reasonable and predictable alternative for dentists looking to shorten the duration of implant-prosthetic treatment for their patients.""

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).

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

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."

**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.

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**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable
Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

This reviewer has been recruited by a partner organization, Research Square. Reviewers with declared or apparent competing interests are not utilized for these reviews. This reviewer has agreed to publication of their comments online under a Creative Commons Attribution License attributed to Research Square and was paid a small honorarium for completing the review within a specified timeframe. Honoraria for reviews such as this are paid regardless of the reviewer recommendation.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal