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Reviewer's report:

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.
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.
Unable to assess

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.
I recommend additional statistical review

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