Reviewer’s report

Title: Complete-arch fixed reconstruction by means of guided surgery and immediate loading: a retrospective clinical study on 12 patients with 1 year of follow-up

Version: 0 Date: 23 Sep 2019

Reviewer: Fabrizia Luongo

Reviewer's report:

the title is pertinent, the abstract is pertinent so no modifications are requested here.

the intro is extremely clear and written very well.

in the methods, not necessary to report the ethics comittee approval immediately at the beginning, this short sub-heading is non useful here. you can move this information at the end of the patient selection chapter.

in addition, although the methods are explained well, the data acquisition has not been performed with an intraorai scanner (why?) and therefore the workflow is partially analog and partially digital. today, it is possible to work in full digital and this is a major limit of this study that should be reported in the discussion session now. intraoral scanners are revolutionizing the dental world and guided surgery is affected too.

moreover, the number of pictures is really too high and some of them are really unnecessary and not significant, for example figures 1g, 6d,6g and 6h, should be cancelled as well as fig. 11a because they do not mean nothing. the contribution of these figures is useless.

i would finally prefere to have a longer follow-up but i understand that is not possible.

about implant survival, i have experienced that it can be lower when implants are placed with guided surgery, because it is not easy to obtain the best primary stability. what the authors found here, looks promising. but how they successfully stabilize their implants?

finally, i do not like the term "procedural complications" i would rather use "immediate post-op complications" dealing with surgery and immediate provisional loading. i kindly ask the authors to correct.

results are given in full and clear, tables are helpful even if the number of patients but not the implants is limited.

the discussion considers the most important similar papers written in the present literature, i appreciate it.

i just would add as a limitation the fact that this workflow is partially digital and not entirely.
in addition, more data are needed on the best implant position to have the possibility to draw specific conclusions and finally the perfect algorithm to define the best implant position for the best esthetic result, through guided surgery. the authors should be aware of it, and not presume too much from this short-term follow up study.
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