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Dear Editors/Reviewers

We would like to thank the reviewers for many helpful comments on our manuscript. We have tried to answer the comments point-by-point below as well as in the manuscript and hope they will be found satisfactory.

For reviewer 1
Thank you again for helpful comments. Under the “discussion” part of the manuscript we have done a comparison with the article by Saeki et al. and commented on possible reasons for difference in results.

For reviewer 2
The following in the manuscript have been adjusted:

- we have improved the information on tissue processing described under “material and method”/ “tissue processing”
- age difference has been commented on in the “discussion”
- the clinical data is now added in the manuscript in two tables.
- RT-PCR has been performed and the results are described in the manuscript
- The statistical methods applied in our work have been better clarified.
- The immunohistochemistry is explained in words. All the cells stained positive but the intensity differed
- All the authors have revised the manuscript to look for spelling or grammar inconsistencies and contributed to concise and sound expression.
- Figures are explained hopefully more sufficient. The dimension on the y-axis is explained. We changed the word “expression” with “transcription levels” in the figures and in the manuscript.
- Non cancer controls are now denominated consistently
- The two points commented in the result section has been changed and explained hopefully more thoroughly.
- We have omitted the first paragraph of the discussion as suggested by the referee.

In addition, one of the authors (Betina Kulle Andresen) did not have time to take part in the revision of the manuscript and therefor asked to be removed.

We hope you will find the revised manuscript satisfactory, and looking forward hearing from you.

Sincerely

Margit Riis
Torben Lüders
Anne-Jorunn Nesbakken
Hilde Vollan
Vessela Kristensen
Ida Bukholm