Author's response to reviews

Title: Membrane testosterone binding sites in prostate carcinoma as a potential new marker and therapeutic target: Study in paraffin tissue sections

Authors:

Constantina I Dambaki (ntampak@hotmail.com)
Christina Kogia (kogiachr@med.uoc.gr)
Marilena Kampa (kampa@med.uoc.gr)
Katherine Darivianaki (stath@med.uoc.gr)
Michael Nomikos (anezinis@med.uoc.gr)
Ploutarchos Anezinis (anezinis@med.uoc.gr)
Panayiotis A. Theodoropoulos (takis@med.uoc.gr)
Elias Castanas (castanas@med.uoc.gr)
Efstathios N. Stathopoulos (stath@med.uoc.gr)

Version: 4 Date: 31 August 2005

Author's response to reviews:

Heraklion August 31, 2005

To: The Editor, BMC Cancer
From: Efstathios N. Stathopoulos, MD, PhD

Dear Dr Iratxe Puebla,

Please find attached a revised version of our work entitled "Membrane testosterone binding sites in prostate carcinoma as a potential new marker and therapeutic target: Study in paraffin tissue sections". In this version we have tried to reply to the Reviewers' comments as follows:

Reviewer 3: We thank the reviewer for his comments, and we add available clinical data as he suggests. Furthermore, we make corrections so that results are not confusing for anyone. In this aim, we slightly modify the expressions related to categorization of tumors studied (pages 12, 17, and 29 of the submitted paper)

a. page 12, second paragraph, text presenting now as follows:
As seen in Figure 4, there is an increased expression of mARs with increasing Gleason's sum (15%, 40%, 44%, 36%, 71%, for Gleason's sums from 5 to 9 respectively.
b. page 17, second paragraph, text presenting now as follows:
No significant difference in mAR expression between Gleason's sum 4+3 (9 out of 20 cases) and Gleason's sum 3+4 (11 out of 21 cases) prostate carcinomas was found.
c. page 29, Legends for the Figure 4, text presenting now as follows: Correlation of mAR positivity with Gleason's sum in prostate carcinomas. Membrane androgen receptors are preferentially expressed in prostate carcinomas and their presence is correlated to Gleason's sum.

Reviewer 4: We thank the reviewer for his constructive recommendations. According to his suggestions:

a. We described our hypotheses (pages 3 and 4 of the new version of the manuscript),
b. We have included in the "Methods" section the statistical procedures used.
c. We added through the paper, where appropriate, statements about the statistical methods that we used (plus results, relating to our hypotheses and not only, as well as the level of significance), and we made our statistics more appropriate and consumable.

Hoping that this new revised version of our manuscript will be found to meet the standards for publication in BMC Cancer,
Sincerely,

E. N. Stathopoulos