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Reviewer's report:

Dear author,

Congratulations on the submission of your research protocol, I hope to value your work with some of the considerations listed below:

Background
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line 11: "... the most prevalent conditions in humans." is a very strong sentence, reminiscent of conventional literature. I suggest replacing it with another more conventional phrase, or include a bibliographical reference that is quite robust to support this sentence.

Line 20-23: "... based on disease ..., based on risk of progression." Replace to avoid misunderstandings.

Line 31-33: "... The objective of treatment is the elimination of periodontal inflammation ...". According to the literature, the purpose of periodontal treatment, at each particular stage, should treat biofilm infection, inflammation and residual sites. This sentence could better show this broader concept at this point in the text.
Line 44-47: "... radical surgical elimination of the defect by sacrificing adjacent healthy ...". Sacrificing is not a common term in scientific literature. I suggest replacing.

Line 47-49: "... to more conservative ... to regenerative ...". I suggest replacing it to avoid misunderstandings in the text.

Line 49-51: "... regeneration of periodontal attachment measurable clinically, radiographically and histologically." I suggest removing the "histologically" because it seems controversial, though correct. It may generate expectation of response to this issue in the case of your protocol.

Line 56-60: "The most recent introduction ... periodontal regeneration.". I think this is the presentation of his technique, the highlight of his introduction. I believe the reader needs to know more about this topic. I also suggest that you do not abbreviate the term "modified- MIST" in the first instance, to be clearer at the outset.
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Line 29: Review the text, it seems duplicate. Only the acronyms of the surgical techniques studied should be used here.

Methods / Design

Line 49- I suggest replacing "examiner-blind" with the term "blind";

Line 51-54: Group names are confusing. I suggest rewriting, separating groups more clearly and objectively.
Study Design Plan / Study visits

Cite the location where the study will be conducted.
Include ERB approval information here.
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Line 33: Cite the manufacturer of the periodontal probe.

Line 40: quote the manufacturer of the Nabers probe.
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Repeatability

Cite the bibliographic reference of the test that will be done.

Best Regards.
Level of interest
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Quality of written English
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Quality of figures
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