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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editors,

enclosed you find the response to all your comments. We have also modified our text according to the new requirements. The modifications, as per your request, have not been highlighted using a different colour, this time.

We truly hope the paper can be acceptable for publication now, after this third revision.

Thank You so much,
Herzlichen Dank,

Dr. Henriette Lerner

HL DENTCLINIC & ACADEMY
Academic Trachini and Research Institution of Johann Wolfgang Goethe-University, Frankfurt am Main, Germany
Ludwig-Wilhelm-Straße 17
BADEN-BADEN
Tel.07221-398730
Fax.07221-3987310
Mob.00491721363192
Editor’s comments:

1. You state that your study was retrospective, however your methods suggest that you carried out implant surgery during your study and your conclusion states 'In our present study, 12 patients received 110 implants'.
Can you please confirm what parts of your study are retrospective? Please also clarify whether implant surgery was carried out during this study or a previous one, and cite any previous study.
If implant surgery was carried out in this current study, please confirm you received ethics approval for this.
If the study was retrospective, please clarify what the patients consented to. Please clarify if the patients consented to analysis of their records and if any further permission from the hospital was required.
Please ensure all of this is included in the main manuscript file.

Dear Editor, yes our study is a retrospective one- not a prospective one. In fact, all data (results etc) were collected at the end of the study, and not prospectively. The fact that the cases were documented with photographs and radiographs should not be considered as an element to define our study as prospective. In fact, we all time collect documentation of our patients, even if we do not write any paper. It is part of the protocols in our Dental Clinic. However, i repeat that our protocol was not defined “a priori”, i.e. prior to start the study. This study, accordingly, cannot be defined as prospective. In addition, there was not a previous study. In this paper, we simply have collected results and documentation of a series of cases, treated under our protocol. We work this way in our Dental Clinic. In the body of our manuscript, we have clarified that the patients gave consent to us, for the collection of data and enrollment in the study. Anyway there is nothing strange, it is the way we work at Frankfurt University. The study was also approved by the Ethics Committee of our University. This is clearly reported in the text. At the end of the Methods, Patient selection, you can find the following sentences that clarify all aspects of this study.
“The principles highlighted in the Helsinki Declaration on experimentation on human subjects were strictly followed. This retrospective study received ethical approval from the Institutional Review Board of the Goethe University of Frankfurt, Germany (number: 182/19). All patients were fully informed on the nature of this retrospective study, read and signed a written consent form for inclusion, and for the analysis of their records, that was approved by the University. In addition, the authors obtained written consent for publication from the patients enrolled in this retrospective study.”

2. For all manuscripts that include details, images, or videos relating to an individual person, we require written consent for publication to be obtained from the individual or next of kin relative if the patient has died. Please can you confirm whether the consent for publication you obtained was written. If so, please clearly state this in the “Consent for publication” section of your manuscript.
We confirm here that we have obtained written consent for publication from the patients enrolled in this retrospective study.

3. Please amend your Availability of Data and Materials section. For more information and a list of suitable availability statements, please see our Submission guidelines: https://www.biomedcentral.com/getpublished/editorial-policies#availability+of+data+and+materials

We did it.

4. Please upload your multi-panel figures as one figure. I.e. each separate figure (figure 1, figure 2, etc) should be one file, not multiple files.

We have corrected all figures as requested.

5. At this stage, please upload your manuscript as a single, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colours. All relevant tables/figures/additional files should also be clean versions. Figures (and additional files) should remain uploaded as separate files.

We did it.