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The manuscript concerns the important subject, antibiotic prophylaxis habits in implant surgery, and high-light some of the serious problems within this field of antibiotic utilization in dentistry. Therefore the results are important.

Major comments

Background/Aim

The secondary aim is stated to be "to assess the nature and amount (mg) of antibiotics prescriptions in order to evaluate whether any consensus has been reached and if the current recommendations are compiled". Later in the manuscript it is stated that there are no recommendations in Italy for this. Please clarify this.

Methods

The questionnaire is not properly described. Furthermore the process of translating and validating is not described. One cannot refer to the original questionnaire and that it was validated. After translation a new validation needs to be performed in order to be able to state that the questionnaire is validated. Proper translation procedure contains the following: One language expert translates from English to Italian. Another translator translates back from Italian to English to check that the phrasing of the questions has not been changed.

If the participants are specialists (if so which) or merely general dentist should be clearly stated and the ratio between the groups. If only general dentists are included as participants, the reason for this should be given. Is the therapy not performed by specialists in Italy? Type of training for implant surgery would be interesting to know. Is it part of basic training in dentistry?

The comment regarding bias is not relevant, especially since the response rate was so low. Other types of biases should be discussed in the discussion section or mentioned in the result section.
Results

Generally there are a lot of figures (3) and tables (6). The authors should consider to reduce the number.

Figure 3 is complicated/busy because of the large number of compounds. It can be more comprehensive if the compounds are group according to type of substance such as:

Macrolides (Clarithromycin+Macrolide+Azithromycin+Rovamycine+Erithromycin)
Likosamider (Clindamycin)
Cephalosporins (Cephalosporin+Cefexime)
Fluoroquinolones (Levofloxacacin+Ciprofloxacin)
Penicillin
No antibiotic (No antibiotic+Ranitidine, which is not an antibiotic compound)
Tetracycline (Doxycycline)
Clavulanic acid

Table 1: Difficult to follow. What means with Graduation in Italy 100% never, 100% sometimes, 96.1% Always, etc, etc.

Regarding Table 2-6. Although important results, an effort should be made to try to display, or illustrate, the prescription in a way that may give a better overview and with less tables.

Discussion

Under "Limitations" the authors should not take lightly on the low response rate and the fact that this could be a bias. A speculation, or some sort of analyse, regarding who the drop-outs are should be added. Are the non-responders not interested? Or over-prescribing individuals? The responders cannot be considered to be representative of the target population because of the low response rate. It can be speculated that this is the case, but not "considered".

Minor comments

Background

Page 3, line 66-67, please rephrase the sentence "Italy was the ninth with more systemic consumption….". As phrased it doesn't make sense.

Page 3, line 69-70, "Several studies found that general practitioners…". Do not use "several" when only one reference is given.

The aim at the end of the introduction could preferably be rephrased from main aim and secondary aim to primary and secondary.
In the aim it is stated that the study was "to determine whether antibiotics prophylaxis is a common treatment in Italy among general dentists". Why weren't specialists included? It would have been interesting to compare general dentists with specialists.

Results

The large gender differences should be commented. Is this due to drop-out or is the ratio between men and women this skewed?

Page 8, line 200: Remove " _ " from macrolide.

Discussion

Remove headings from discussion.

Page 9, line 205 and 206: "...did not complied with their recommendations." Grammatically incorrect, but also, here the authors refer to some recommendations. Previously in the manuscript it was stated that there are no guidelines in Italy.

Under "Generalizability", here is a result mentioned that is not to be found in the result section.

Under "Conclusion", "...and they are not adhering to the new science-based specifications." What is meant with science-based specification? Add reference or clarify in text.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

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.

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.

I recommend additional statistical review
Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal