

Review of: "Bisphosphonate-Related Osteonecrosis of the Jaws Treated with Platelet-Rich Plasma: Preliminary Results from a Case Series"

André Shinohara

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The article is intended to evaluate the ability of a BPFC platelet-rich plasma preparation (Bioplasma®) to favor the healing process of patients affected by BRONJ.

However, some important points must be reviewed by researchers:

The introduction is very extensive. I suggest that some information from the introduction should be placed in the discussion, in order to reduce the introduction.

There is a conceptual error when mentioning angiogenesis, since antiresorptive effect of bisphosphonates acts on osteoclasts, not on VGEf. That statement needs to be clarified in the introduction section.

This study was based on data collected from 35 patients (15 men and 20 women) aged between 51 and 78 years old, with a mean age of 64 years. However, the results according to sex and age were not presented.

Moreover, it was described the following details about the procedures: "All patients were enrolled in an annual recall program to assess the absence of BRONJ or the remission of the condition and clinical signs. Return visits were set at 7 days, 14 days, 1 month, 3 months, 6 months, and 12 months postoperatively". However, the results for each period were not presented.

The research also described that several clinical examinations were carried out and the following parameters were investigated: pain, swallowing, healing, exposed bone or oral fistulas. The absence of these clinical parameters was defined as clinical success. In addition, an orthopantomogram examination and a Cone-Beam tomography were performed at baseline (surgery) and at 12-month recall. Nonetheless, the response to these investigations was not described in the results.

The results section is lacking in details and need to be rebuilt.

The discussion seems like an introduction and the informations are provided without comparison with other works in the literature. Besides, there is no argument about the research results. Therefore, the discussion must be renewed.

The figures presented are not essential, tables and graphs of the results are necessary.

I do not recommend the article for publication.

