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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for submitting this manuscript, however I would like to put you attention to the following shortcomings of your research project and the manuscript.

I feel very superficially you have divided you patients to two groups depending on the age, sex and whether they are taking bisphosphonate or not, without taking the other important factors involved in alveolar bone loss. Your article does not clearly indicate the types of the bisphosphonate drugs, purpose for receiving it (For example; as a part of the treatment for osteoporosis, to reduce bone destruction in a bone invading malignant condition or to reduce bone loss in those who are on long term systemic steroids.) and the duration of time they were on that drug. Please also indicate how many of your patients were on the bisphosphonate treatment during your investigation period.

Explain how can you compare the bone levels of BIS and no BIS groups and come into a conclusion after they had different types of periodontal treatment during the investigative period? (In table 4 you haven't clearly mention when these treatment procedures were performed.)

In table 2 why you need to mention the patients under 57 years of age if your sample only consists of patients aged from 57 to 88 years. Please omit the unnecessary data.

Please add the missing details to the reference 12 and address the spelling and grammatical mistakes in the manuscript.
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.

No

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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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