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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript "Minimizing risk of customized titanium mesh exposure" reports on customized titanium mesh exposure following bone defect augmentation. My concerns regarding the work are outlined below:

First, the title should indicate that this is a retrospective analysis/case series.

Abstract: Background: Please switch the first and second sentences.

Results: Regarding the result p = 0.029, because the significance level applied was p < 0.05, this is no longer a trend.

Introduction

P 1 L 8: The sentence should end after the word "management."

Study population

Please indicate the study's patient inclusion and exclusion criteria.

P 3 L 17 - 21: This information should not be part of the study population section. The outcome assessment section (primary and secondary) is missing. Please consider including this information (L 17-21) in the previously indicated missing section.

No information is provided on the follow-up period. At what time points the outcomes were assessed?
P 4 L 11-12: Here, please indicate what incisions were performed. The authors only indicated this in the results section.

P 4 L 19: Please indicate how many patients received autogenous bone grafts from the iliac crest and how many received grafts from intraoral sites. Please also indicate where intraorally autogenous bone was taken. Were defect size and width assessed?

P 5 L 7-10: This information should be moved one paragraph above.

Data evaluation

Again, what were the primary and secondary outcomes, and according to which statistical tests were they assessed? This should be clearly indicated.

Results

How many cases failed?

How was failure defined?

Discussion

P 8 L 3: Please specify these benefits.

P 4 L 15: It is easier to write from 14.8% to 59% and add all references at the end of the sentence.

P 4 Ö 17: Regarding defect size and severity of exposure, please explain for the readers: do you mean that the bigger the defect is, the more severe the exposure?

P 4 Ö 23: If this does not necessarily lead to failure, how many cases failed? How was failure defined? To make such a statement, you must clearly indicate the above.

P 9 L 6-7: However, it might be associated with the limited number of patient subgroups in this study. The same goes for P9 L 8 - 12.

P 9 L 13: Here, you should write 'One might' because a letter is missing."

P9 L 13 - How were the thin and thick phenotypes defined? Please add a reference. In addition, an explanation should be added to the M&M section.
P 9 L 15: Regarding reference 27, how did this author define thin and thick phenotypes? Different definitions lead to different results, so please clarify this.

P 9 L 22 - P 10 L 9: Please present the discussion on gender in a more readable manner.

P 11 L 6: At the end of the sentence, please add a reference.

P 11 L 8: At the end of the sentence, please add a reference.

The study's limitations must be discussed.

Conclusions:

P 12 L 4: The authors claim that this does not affect the outcome. Firstly, what was that outcome? The conclusions must be based only on the findings.

The authors found a significant association between gender and exposure, so how can you make the statement in P 12 L 7?

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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