Author’s response to reviews

Title: Factors affecting the early failure of implants placed in a dental practice with a specialization in implantology – a retrospective study

Authors:

Johannes Krisam (johannes.krisam@imbi.uni-heidelberg.de)
Larissa Ott (larissa.ott@med.uni-heidelberg.de)
Stephanie Schmitz (dr.stephanie.schmitz@web.de)
Anna-Luisa Klotz (anna-luisa.klotz@med.uni-heidelberg.de)
Aida Seyidaliyeva (aida.seyidaliyeva@med.uni-heidelberg.de)
Peter Rammelsberg (peter.rammelsberg@med.uni-heidelberg.de)
Andreas Zenthöfer (andreas.zenthoefer@med.uni-heidelberg.de)

Version: 2 Date: 31 Jul 2019

Author’s response to reviews:

OHEA-D-19-00188R1

Factors affecting the early failure of implants placed in a dental practice with specialization in implantology – a retrospective study

BMC Oral Health

Reviewer reports:

Jeffrey Wessel (Reviewer 1): 1. The actual name of the doctor is not needed in the manuscript and I recommend removal of it.

Response to comment: Yes you are right, we removed the dentist's name.

2. The discussion mentions an 'acceptable' range of failure for implants. What is acceptable? Is there an established standard? I think more appropriately this refers to the rate of failure being similar to what has previously been reported. I recommend clarifying this more and not just saying 'acceptable.'
Response to comment: Thank you for this helpful comment. We changed the respective statement and now say that healing is successful and rates are similar to those reported by previous studies.

3. The discussion indicates the diabetics in this study were well regulated because they reported taking their medications. Diabetic control is not measured by taking of medications, rather an objective HbA1C value should be used to assess diabetic control. You can say the diabetic patients were compliant with medications but not necessarily that they were well controlled.

Response to comment: Yes, our wording was to far-fetched. We adjusted this part according to your recommendation.

4. The discussion includes a statement indicating when an implant is placed at the same time as grafting, the outcome is not readily predictable but there is no reference to support this. Do you have data that proves simultaneous augmentation increases the rate of implant failure?

Response: Thank you, this is important to add. In this paragraph of discussion we speculated on a possible influence. With respect to this, failures vary across different augmentative approaches of course; the delayed implantation after grafting offers the opportunity to estimate the development / healing of the graft before (shrinkage / failure..). We added / now cite thematic studies.

5. I recommend replacing the word 'fuzziness' in the discussion with something more appropriate. I feel there is a better way to describe a lack of clarity.

Response to comment: Yes, you are right, we changed the wording following your recommendation.

6. The conclusion includes the word 'convenient' in a statement. This is not the appropriate word choice here and should be replaced.

Response to comment: Thank you. We now write that the failure rates are similar to previous studies.

Andreas Parashis (Reviewer 2): The authors have adequately addressed all the reviewers comments and the article has greatly improved.

However, an issue was identified following the information provided by the authors on comment 3 " More information about the background of the dentists participating in clinical treatment is necessary, e.g. postgraduate studies, specialization, continued education, years in practice and years of placing implants before 2012 that data was assessed etc. This is necessary in order to generalize or not the results for every general dental practice. This information and possible
implications must also be included in the discussion and the conclusions adjusted accordingly."
Based on the information provided "One

of the participating dentists (Stephanie Schmitz, D1) graduated in 2008 and passed a specialized
course in dental implantology offered by the German Society of Oral Implantology ('Curriculum
Implantology'). When treating the patient sample, her professional experience thus ranged
between four and nine years. The other dentist (D2) passed their final exams in 2015. All implant
treatments performed by D2 were supervised by D1."

My personal opinion is that the results of this paper are not reflecting a general dental practice
but a specialized implantology practice. Therefore, the entire structure and title of the paper must
be changed to reflect that the results are from a specialized implantology practice.

I believe is misleading to suggest that these results are reflecting a general dental practice.

Response to comment: Yes, you are right. I am with you. we were uncertain on this issue when
we drafted the manuscript because dentist 1 has a specialization in implantology but is still rather
young and offers the full spectrum of dentistry to her patients. However, specialization is
specialization. Thus, we changed the entire manuscript accordingly including the title.