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Dear Editor,

Please find the enclosed version of “Analysis of and prognostic information from disseminated tumour cells in bone marrow in primary breast cancer: a prospective observational study” R2 which has now been revised according to the reviewer’s comment and edited according to the BMC Cancer’s instructions.

The revision can be followed in this point-by-point description:

**Referee 1**

Compulsory revisions

1. The aspirates and false positive rate in healthy donors has now been included in the abstract.
   “Bone marrow aspirates from adult healthy bone marrow donors were analysed separately.”
   “The analyses were positive for epithelial cells in bone marrow from adult healthy donors in 19 (25%) samples.”

2. The last sentence in the abstract has been corrected according to the reviewer.
   “Future studies with a standardised patient protocol and improved technique for isolating and detecting DTCs may reveal the clinical applications of DTC detection in patients with micrometastases in the bone marrow.”

3. The information has been included in the methods section on p 7.
   “The analysis was not performed in 117 patients due to change in research strategy at our laboratory.”

**Referee 2**

No comments
Referee 3

There were no other scientific comments from this reviewer.

The referee commented on the English language and since the former version had been linguistically revised by Edanz, we contacted them again. According to them, one of the senior linguistic editors was satisfied with the English language in the former manuscript. We contacted the editorial office of BMC Cancer for advice, forwarding the conversation with Edanz, but didn’t get any answer from the executive editor so far. The resubmission time is due today and therefore we submit the revised manuscript in order not to exceed the time-limit.

If the editor wants a second professional linguistic revision, we are willing to make this via Edanz. The time-limit then has to be extended and we do hope that you will not consider it a third revision since we didn’t get any notice from you.

We hope you find the second revision of the manuscript satisfying and find the paper suitable for publication in your journal. All authors have read and approved the final version of the manuscript.

With best regards,

Lisa Rydén,
Corresponding author