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Dear BioMed Central Editorial Team

Thank you for the review of our manuscript, *(Clinical and histological characterization of oral pemphigus lesions in patients with skin diseases: a cross sectional study from Sudan).* The manuscript has been revised and edited according to the suggestions from reviewers. Please find attached:

- Authors' responses to reviews
- Version (4) manuscript.

Sincerely yours,

On behalf of the authors,

Nada M Suliman
Authors’ responses to reviews (4)

Reviewer: Thorakkal Shamim

Reviewer: “The article can be accepted but the authors should explain the following parameters in the present study in the discussion part”

Reviewer: “Why direct and indirect immunofluorescence studies and ELISA not done”

Authors’ response: Direct and indirect immunofluorescence studies and ELISA were not included in the aim of the present study (page 6). The aim was to assess the diagnostic significance of routine histolopathology along with immunohistochemical (IHC) examination of formalin-fixed, paraffin-embedded biopsy specimens in patients with oral pemphigus. However, we have clarified why the above mentioned techniques were not in the hospital protocol to diagnose PV (page 21). More clarification has been added in the discussion part according to the reviewer request (Page 21).

Reviewer: “Why genomic studies not done”

Authors’ response: This is beyond the scope of the present study (objectives, page 6)
Reviewer: “What is the significance of this study in Sudan and how it differs from other population”

Authors’ response: This has been addressed in the discussion part (page 14, 15) and the conclusion part (page 22)

Reviewer: “The authors should include following references in the article”


c. Shamim T. Comments on the article “Reintroducing the tzanck smear”. The American Journal of Clinical Dermatology 2010 Oct 1; 11(5): 370

Authors’ response: We have cited “Candida smear: an adjunct for diagnosis of acantholytic cells in oral pemphigus vulgaris” (Page 20). Others are not relevant to cite in the present study.