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Reviewer's report:

The authors of the current manuscript aimed to evaluate patients treated by maxillectomy and obturator prosthesis for reconstruction. In this survey, the authors evaluated the patients’ quality of life after integration of the obturator prosthesis. I would like to raise some queries:

1) I believe that reconstruction immediately after tumor resection remains a standard approach in tumor patients, which has been shown to be a European as well as a worldwide standard. (see Kansy et al.) This needs to be mentioned here.

2) Restoration of form and function cannot be achieved by obturator prosthesis, since this restoration is not stable, as also presented in the current survey. The authors critically have to discuss the indications for prosthesis vs. reconstruction by free flaps.

3) The prosthesis does not simplify oncological follow ups, since infection and worse fits generate potential confounders and probably more biopsies, which can easily detected by CT scans also if reconstructed. I therefore disagree with this statement.

4) There are several studies with this concern. Especially in QoL and maxillectomy patients. If the authors would have a higher grade of evidence, they should state this, but not that there is a lack of evidence.

5) The results can be also interpreted as there is not a well suited soluted provided. This is more a point of view, but I believe that for a correct analysis reconstructed patients need to be integrated in this study for objective and valid analysis.

In conclusion, the present study does not provide a scientific based result which can be supported by the study design. It is more a cohort study without a control group with several bias included. In addition, the authors views are included and not objective. I recommend rejection of the manuscript.
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