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Reviewer's report:

1. The actual name of the doctor is not needed in the manuscript and I recommend removal of it.

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.'

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.

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?

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.

6. The conclusion includes the word 'convenient' in a statement. This is not the appropriate word choice here and should be replaced.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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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.
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.
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