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Reviewer's report:

clearly the manuscripts has benefit from the first round of revision, still there are some parts that needs improvement

1) in the abstract you should clearly state that these 9 patients were fully edentulous, because you treated 9 patients with 18 rehabilitations, so these patients were fully edentulous in the upper and lower jaws. the correct terminology you should use in the abstract is "upper jaw" and "lower jaw" or as alternative "maxilla" and "mandible", but you cannot identify the maxilla with the generic term "jaws" because it is not appropriate. in addition, the exclusion criteria should stand after the inclusion criteria and not after you report on the included patients (patient number). moreover i would appreciate if you could identify if your study was prospective or retrospective, and to define the outcome variables is necessary. the abstract results should be expanded.

2) more keywords are needed, add 2 more

3) introduction. apparently, there are issues with the reference list. in fact, you cannot start from ref. 4. where are ref. 1,2 and 3? please rewrite. please insert page numbers in your word document. anyway when you cite Prof. Branemark and the Toronto bridge, you fail to provide appropriate references and the work of Prof. Zarb is not mentioned- why the Toronto bridge has this name? not only because of Branemark. "The classic Toronto have a titanium bar with teeth and resin flange, this prosthesis has a good prognosis, but it is, unfortunately, not equally valid over time from an aesthetic point of view, and acrylic resin does not allow an adequate resistance response when the prosthesis is subjected to a load" no references here? who tells this?

4) methods. no need to report the link for declaration of helsinki. once again not clear if the study is a prospective or a retrospective one. methodology must be clarified. inclusion and exclusion criteria should stand before to give the number of enrolled patients. it is advisabile to divide and split the methods in different sections. what were the variables investigated in this study? why you do not mention them? does the work include a statistical evaluation? if yes, a few words on that are recommended.

5) results section should be structured in full accordance with the variables investigated as highlighted in the methods, more order is needed here
6) no one single word on the limits of your study, but i have mechanical doubts on this structure, that should be considered in the light of the evidence emerging from the literature

7) the conclusions are ok but the results of the study should be summarized in order

8) references are appropriate in content, but here ref 1,2 and 3 appear, but these references are not in the text, please control this

9) fig. 6 b, i do not see the prosthesis in the mouth, i want to see the full picture with the patient, it is not acceptable to cut the figure as it is, i do not see the whole picture

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?
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