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Joanna Ilvesaro, Pasi Tavi and Juha Tuukkanen

Revised Manuscript
“Connexin-Mimetic Peptide Gap 27 Decreases Osteoclastic Activity”

Oulu, November 15, 2001

Dear Editorial Assistant Ruth King,

I have made the corrections and revisions asked by the two reviewers to the revised manuscript I know submit. Please find the point by point response to the referees’ comments below.

I wish the revised manuscript will meet your standards and that it would be published in the Journal. If you still have some questions about the manuscript, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Looking forward to hearing from You.

Yours truly,

Joanna Ilvesaro

Reviewer: Dr Karin Schirrmacher

We have changed the title of Results 3.1. so that there no longer is the word "Apoptosis" in the title. The new title now states “3.1. Inhibition of Gap-Junctional Communication Leads to the Decrease in Osteoclastic Survival Rate”. As the reviewer suggests, we have speculated the possible involvement of different proliferation rates of treated and untreated cells in the discussion (page 10 lines 5-7). The referee also mentioned the lack of evidence of apoptotic osteoclasts in the manuscript and asked which methods have been used in determining the apoptosis. Since the apoptosis of osteoclasts seems to be too strong statement with the method used in this manuscript, we have corrected the manuscript so, that we talk about the survival of osteoclasts, and not apoptosis.

Major points:
1. We have omitted the term apoptosis from the title as suggested by the referee. The new title now says: “3.1. Inhibition of Gap-Junctional Communication Leads to the Decrease in Osteoclastic Survival Rate” Page 7, lines 2-3.
2. We have corrected the sentence from the abstract as suggested by the reviewer to “On the basis of these results we conclude that gap-junctional communication is essential for the action of bone resorbing osteoclasts and for proper remodelling for bone.” Page 2, lines 19-20.
3. We have removed the paragraph mentioned by the referee (Page 8, second paragraph) and it is moved to the discussion. **Page 9 last paragraph continuing to page 10.**
4. We have also removed the sentence mentioned by the reviewer and moved it to the discussion. **Page 10, last paragraph, lines 3-4.**
5. The descriptions of the figures 4B and 4C have been changed to meet the figures as corrected by the referee. **Page 8, last paragraph, lines 4-5.**
6. The citation has been added to the sentence as asked by the referee. **Page 9, line 9.**
7. We have added the sentence asked by the referee and the and the papers the referee mentioned have been cited. **Page 11, lines 6-8.**
8. The word “significantly” has been removed as asked. **Figure legend 2, page 17.**
9. Labels (A), (B) and (C) have been added to the figures 1.
10. Labels (A), (B) and (C) have been added to the figures 4.
11. Statistic p values have been added to figure legends Figure 3.
12. Statistic p values have been added to figure legends Figure 4.

Minor points:
1. The word “cells” have been added to the sentence as asked by the referee. **Page 10, line 6.**
2. The corrections to the references asked by the referee have been made.
3. Figure legend for Figure 4 labels (A), (B) and (C) have been written in bold as asked. **Page 17**
4. The extra word “and” has been removed from the sentence. **Page 17.**

---

**Reviewer Dr. H. Donahue:**

1. We have changed the manuscript so, that we do not emphasise the role of apoptosis anymore, but we use the term “osteoclastic survival” in context of speaking about the decrease in the number of osteoclasts (see the response and corrections made according to Dr. Schirrmacher’s comments)
2. We have added some text to the discussion according to Dr. Schirrmacher’s comments and suggestions, which we hope pleases this reviewer as well by making the discussion more complete.
3. We have made the ANOVA test which indicates that all the groups are significantly different as referee suggested. We have added the mentioning of this to the Methods section. **Page 6, last paragraph.**