Author's response to reviews

Title: The vaginal microflora in relation to gingivitis

Authors:

Rutger G Persson (rutger.persson@zmk.unibe.ch)
Jane Hitti (jhitti@u.washington.edu)
Rita Verhelst (rita.verhelst@UGent.be)
Mario Vaneechoutte (mario.vanechoutte@UGent.be)
Rigmor E Persson (rigmor.persson@zmk.unibe.ch)
Regula Hirschi (regula.hirschi@zmk.unibe.ch)
Marianne Weibel (marianne.weibel@zmk.unibe.ch)
Marilynn Rothen (rothen@u.washington.edu)
Kathleen Paul (kpaul@u.washington.edu)
Marleen Temmerman (marleen.temmerman@UGent.be)
David Eschenbach (eschen@u.washington.edu)

Version: 3 Date: 31 October 2008

Author's response to reviews: see over
Comments and revisions made to the manuscript

We appreciate the careful review. This forced us to once more revisit the data set to confirm our findings. Changes have been made according to the suggestion made by Dr. Brigidi while attempting not to change any of the changes suggested and required by the other reviewers.

Given the overall critique that the report, at times, appear confusing both the abstract and the main text components were amended as outlined below.

1. Abstract has been in part rewritten to be consistent with the main text. We have eliminated some information that could be considered as less relevant. This was done to limit the length of the abstract but foremost to focus on the primary questions.

We limited the significant finding at the p<0.001 level for bacteria. Thus there were 38/49 species that differed by BV diagnosis and independent of gingival diagnosis. This information plus what we had forgotten to include on lactobacilli was added. We also revised the text in regards to gingival condition (BV+/G+) versus the (BV-/G-) 11 species were added, thereby the 49/74 species. The text has been edited for the purpose of readability.

The conclusions were revised.

2. The text in regards to T.forsythia does not belong here. The paragraph is deleted.

3. The “added text” under results has been deleted as suggested by the reviewer.

4. The figure was included in the manuscript with legends. The reviewer may not have received this information. This illustration we believe is useful and much more so than the previous one.

5. The discussion has been edited and is reduced and should hopefully now read better.

6. (1Page 8) This paragraph has been revised. We have revisited the data set and made changes accordingly to the results.

7. (2 Page 8) This text has been deleted

8. (3. Page 8) in accordance with....

This paragraph has been rewritten.

9. (4. Page 10). Text has been deleted and revised text inserted

10. (5-6.Pages 10 and 11). The text has been revised and the requested text deleted.

11. (Page 11) The conclusion has been revised and is now focused on primary findings
**Minor revisions**

Page 4 background
The ? mark is deleted.

Page 8
The GV+ has been changed to BV+

Pages 10 and 11
The text has been revised

Table 2 has been revised consistent with other revisions of results

In addition minor typos not revealed in the review process have been eliminated. For consistency we have replaced „subject“ with „woman“