

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade C (A great deal of language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors:

This is an interesting case report. The authors used the lateral-window bone plate from sinus lifting procedure as a bone block donor for horizontal bone augmentation at the neighboring surgical site. The surgical result looks fine after final implant placement. Several minor comments need to be revised or answered.

1. The English of this manuscript have several grammar errors. The manuscript has better be edited again.

Response: Thank you for your feedback and for bringing this to our attention. The manuscript has been revised accordingly.

2. Title: “for correcting” is suggested to change to “to correct”.

Response: Thank you for pointing that out. We have made the correction in our revised manuscript.

3. Page 1: “Bio-gide” should change to “Bio-Gide”.

Response: We have made the correction from 'Bio-gide' to 'Bio-Gide '. We appreciate your attention to detail.

4. Page 2: “complain” should change to “complaint”.

Response: We have made the necessary correction from 'complain' to 'complaint'. We appreciate your attention to detail.

5. Page 3: Please revise about the usage of mouthwash. How many days was the CHX mouthwash used before surgery? Three minutes for each time?

Response: We apologize for any confusion. To clarify, the mouthwash was only used immediately prior to the surgery, and there was no specific regimen of mouthwash use in the days leading up to the procedure. Each rinsing session lasted for three minutes. We have made modifications in the revised manuscript.

6. Page 3: “Articaine” should change to “articaine”. Please confirm that the articaine is 2% instead of 4%. Most of the 3M articaine product is 4%.

Response: Thank you for bringing this to our attention. We have made the necessary correction, changing 'Articaine' to 'articaine'. Regarding the concentration, we confirm that the articaine used in our study is indeed 4%. We appreciate your diligence in ensuring accuracy.

7. Figure 2D: It is a pity that the suspected pseudocyst was not sent for pathological examination under microscope.

Response: We appreciate the reviewer's comment regarding Figure 2D. We understand the importance of conducting a pathological examination under a microscope for the suspected pseudocyst, which could have provided valuable insights. However, due to limitations in time

and resources, we were unable to perform this examination in the current case. We acknowledge the significance of this suggestion and will consider incorporating it into future research endeavors. Thank you for the reviewer's attention to our case report and for their valuable feedback.

8. Page 5: "Albrektsson et al." needs the reference source.

Response: Thank you for bringing this to our attention. The reference source for Albrektsson et al. will be added.

9. "Reference" should change to "References".

Response: Thank you for bringing this to our attention. We have corrected it accordingly.

10. References: The formats are inconsistent regarding "upper- and lower- cases" of the titles and "full names or abbreviations for the cited journals". Please revise each reference and let the format be consistent.

Response: Thank you for bringing this to our attention. We have corrected it accordingly.