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Reviewer's report:

The concerns regarding the manuscript "Minimizing risk of customized titanium mesh exposure - a retrospective analysis" are reported below:

Abstract:

1. Methods

   Lines 14-15 - An exposure rate was investigated - perhaps this is what authors means. The impact of factors such as .... On the exposure rate was assessed - again, perhaps this is what authors meant.

   The current formulation is not acceptable.

Results

2. Lines 2-3: 'Surgical splints were not evaluated to reduce the exposure rate (p = 0.029)' - please double-check this. This must be a mistake.

3. Introduction Page 2 L 4 - 'should be describes' - probably authors meant were assessed - mind the language!

Methods

4. P 3 L 23-24 - please, make one sentence out of two. Better use (e.g…) instead of separating the last sentence.

5. Outcome assessment section should follow after the Workflow and surgery section.

6. P 4 L3-4 - please, define your primary outcome? Was it grafting success? Was it exposure rate? Was it the assessment of factors such as A-PRF.. etc on the exposure rate? There are 3 different outcomes. Elucidate it and please report in understandable manner. At what time points were these different outcomes assessed - after 2 weeks? After 4-8 weeks? This must be very clear.

7. P 4 L 10 - opportunity -* perhaps authors meant 'feasibility of implant placement'
8. P 4 L 11 - was primary stability assessed: Ncm?

9. P 6 L 4-6 - See comment Nr 6!

10. P 6 L 7 - what is well-balanced - perhaps authors meant equally distributed?

11. P 6 L 20 - a possible exposure rate - perhaps authors meant exposure rate.

12. P 6 L 20 - methods to reduce - perhaps authors meant impact of such factors as XXXX on the exposure rate.

Results

13. P 8 L 22 - no failures occurred - did you mean no implants failed? Or it is meant the same as in line 5?

14. P 8 L 23 - see comment Nr 2.

Discussion

15. P 11 L 1 - you mean perhaps - no measurements of the defect were assessed! Description provided by the surgeon mean nothing when it comes to the publication. Consider reformulation.

16. P 12 L 5-12 - this paragraph is hard to understand. It must be rewritten in a readable way. What is the link between the scar tissue and biotype?

17. P 12 L 19 - how gender female and steroid hormones may influence exposure rate.

18. P 14 L 9 - An obvious trend to reduce - what exposure rates were reported without the use of surgical splints? Be specific.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
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