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Author’s response to reviews: see over
Dear Mr Pueblo,

herewith I am returning the third revision of the article: “MS: 2091676334166652 - Nuclear hBD-1 accumulation in malignant salivary gland tumours.” Alterations are highlighted in the revised text as in the first and second revision; my reply is in red text colour:

**Reviewer 4:**
The manuscript has been improved satisfactorily. It is acceptable for publication in BMC Cancer.

**No changes were made according to Reviewer 4.**

**Reviewer 2:**
In Methods, the immunohistochemical analysis to quantify nuclear proportion could be clearer, for example, was the cell counting made in consecutive fields?
Table 2 could be inserted in Results instead of Methods, in my opinion. I agree with the changes in Discussion and Conclusions.
Cell counting was made in consecutive fields; we specified this in the text (methods section, immunohistochemistry). Table 2 was transferred to the Results section.

**Further Revisions:**

**Abstract:** Please elaborate the Background section of the abstract to place the study in the context of the current knowledge in the field, in addition to stating the aims of the research. Please remember to also update the abstract details on the submission page.

The abstract was changed as required.

**Ethical approval:** Please document under the Methods section the details of the institutional review board that granted ethical approval for the study.

Procedures involving the human tissue sampling collection followed a protocol approved by the ethical board of the University of Bonn. This sentence was added to the methods section.

**Competing interests:** Please include a Competing interests section between the Conclusions and Authors contributions.

A Competing interests section was included as suggested.

**Authors' contributions:** Please include an Authors' contributions section after the Competing interests.

An Authors' contributions section was included as well.

**Additional files:** Please delete the additional files containing your cover letter. Tables that fit in a A4 page and are integral to the manuscript should be included within the manuscript file and pasted at the end.

We deleted the additional files containing our cover letter and integrated Table 1 and 2 into the text.

Yours sincerely

Dr. Dr. M. Wenghoefer