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Author’s response to reviews:

Reviewer #1: The article contains a well known topic which was already described decades ago. The authors described a new method to fixate well known subperiostal implants using the selective laser melting method and fixation screws. The language used in this article should be corrected by a native speaker. Statistical analyses are not needed. The reviewer recommends a better labelling of the figure legends. That will make the article easier to read. Otherwise a good article that merits publication, the reviewer will recommend to publish the paper after discretionary revisions. The only issue need to be mention is that the authors should add more recent references.

Thank you for this comment. In the revised version of the manuscript the labelling of the figures are improved and we added more references, especially in the discussion. However we describe a new technique, therefore we don’t find any current references for a real comparison. To improve spelling and grammar, a native English speaker has helped us eliminate errors of spelling and grammar and avoid inaccuracies and misunderstandings.

Reviewer #2: Language review - very good

Thank you for this compliment. As mentioned above, we improved the language.
Reviewer #3: So far this is only a detailed technical report describing the planning and manufacturing of the described devices. I would recommend to wait with the publication until some animal studies have been successfully carried out.

The reviewer is right, the abstract was intended as an technical report only. We combined techniques, which are described detailed in the literature. The subperiostal implants and the principles of osteosynthesis are well known procedures. As a consequence of this we avoid animal studies; furthermore there is no reliable model of an animal study, which is able to allow a real comparison to human.

Even the old subperiostal implants were successful over many years until either exposed or until the "abutments" broke. When such an implant had to be removed usually a large bone defect resulted with many bad consequences for the patient. This may also happen here in spite of CAD/CAM techniques. All this should be added at length in the discussion.

Thank you for this comment. We added a chapter, where we discussed the suggestions and representations of the reviewer.

The English language has to be revised. There are many misspelled words.

As mentioned above, we improved the language.