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Dear Editor,

I am sending for publication to your distinguished Journal the revised manuscript entitled: “Decreased Hsp90 expression in infiltrative lobular carcinoma: an immunohistochemical study.”

We have made all the revisions indicated by your distinguished Reviewers. Please find a point-to-point reply in the next pages.

Yours sincerely,

George C. Zografos,
Professor of Surgery
University of Athens
We would like to thank you for having our manuscript accepted, as well as for the time spent on revising our manuscript. Following your comments throughout the revisions, we believe that the final revised version of the manuscript has been substantially improved.

«1. Abstract: remove the sentence 'some epithelial cells also showed nuclear staining’ as its significance is not clear.»
- The sentence indicated by your distinguished reviewer has been removed from the abstract (Abstract section, page 2, line 12).

«2. Abstract: add the p-value for a marginal decrease in Hsp90 staining intensity.»
- The p-value has been added in the abstract (Abstract section, page 2, line 17, 18).

«3. Background: neoplasia is misspelled in paragraph 3.»
- In the final version, the term “neoplasia” has been correctly written in the background section (Background section, page 3, paragraph 3, line 2).

«4. Methods: add scoring criteria for ER, PR and HER2.»
- The scoring criteria for ER, PR and HER2 have been added according to the indication of the Reviewer (Results section, page 5, paragraph 2&3).

«5. Use Ki-67 instead of ki-67.»
- Ki-67 has been replaced by “ki-67” throughout the manuscript (Methods section, page 6, paragraph 3, lines 2 and 6; results section, page 7, paragraph 4, line 6; discussion section, page 9, paragraph 1, line 2).

«6. Results: Consider 'Given that c-erbB2 HAS BEEN REPORTED TO POSITIVELY ASSOCIATE with Hsp90 expression (7), it is tempting to ....... between c-erbB2 status and Hsp90 Allred score in OUR cohort'.»
- The aforementioned sentence has been rephrased, as indicated by your distinguished reviewer (Discussion section, page 8, paragraph 3, line 2-4 and 6).

«7. It would also recommend to have the manuscript checked for language before publication. There are some problems such as 'the percentage of positive cells and the intensity WAS separately analyzed’ etc.»
- The manuscript has been checked and revised before publication as indicated by your reviewer.

«Discretionary Revisions
None
Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.»