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General Response:
We revised the reviewed MS 1329282201185463 according to the Editor’s remarks and Muna Sabah’s suggestions. The ethical approval was documented under the Methods section.

Former Title:
p53 expression is significantly correlated with high risk of malignancy and epithelioid differentiation in gastrointestinal stromal tumors. An immunohistochemical study with 104 GISTs

New Title:
P53 expression is significantly correlated with high risk of malignancy and epithelioid differentiation in GISTs. An immunohistochemical study of 104 cases

Authors:
Ursula Pauser, Nina Schmedt auf der Günne, Günter Klöppel, Hartmut Merz, Alfred C. Feller

Version: 3  Date: 1 June 2008
Reviewer: Muna Sabah
Reviewer’s report:

Major compulsory revisions: No need for major compulsory revision.

Minor essential revisions:
1- P53 should be replaced by p53 throughout the manuscript. It was Dr Sabah who has suggested in the first review to alter “c-kit protein” into “KIT”. Therefore, we used capitals to indicate proteins throughout the revised MS (and italics for genes). We applied this rule consequently, also to P53. Support for our decision came from OMIM where the tumor protein TP53 is named alternatively P53 and TRP53 (website: ncbi.nlm.nih.gov). The symbol P53 is likewise listed by HUGO (website: genenames.org).

2- Page 4, line 14 there is no space between CD and 34. – Space eliminated.

3- The authors mention the p53 is detected in pleomorphic type (discussion page 10) but according to their materials and methods they classified GISTs into spindle or epithelioid types only without mentioning the pleomorphic type. – Done.

4- The use of English made some paragraphs ambiguous. This global criticism forced us to check the text once more and to make minor corrections.

- Background: The last sentence is not clear. Perhaps the autos meant that the aim of the study was to evaluate cell cycle regulators as potential prognostic markers in GISTs. – Thanks for this suggestion.

- Conclusion: The last sentence on the Abstract is not clear. – Now it should be.

- Discussion: Line 12 should read “in agreement with” – Done.

- The second half of page 10 (is not clear and the authors should consider rewriting this page). – Done.