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To,

The Editor,
BMC Oral Health

Dear Sir,

Thank you for your response and the comments from the referees concerning our manuscript titled “Periodontal conditions, oral Candida albicans and salivary proteins in type 2 diabetic subjects with emphasis on gender” (Manuscript ID: 3328842932290015).

The manuscript has been revised according to the referees’ comments and we have responded to the reviewers’ comments point by point in the attached pdf file. Changes are highlighted in yellow in the revised manuscript.

We would like to express our gratitude to the Referee no.2 (Yutaka Seino) for his valuable insight and to you for your interest in our work.

Yours sincerely,

Fawad Javed
DDS, PhD
Corresponding author
Karolinska Institutet, Institute of Odontology, Division of Research, Box 4064, SE 141 04, Huddinge, SWEDEN.
Ph: +46 70 430 4909 Fax: +46 8 711 83 43 Email: fawad.javed@ki.se
Reviewer 2: Yutaka Seino

We thank Reviewer 2 for thorough reading of the manuscript and for relevant and constructive comments.

- Survival of teeth is strongly influenced by many factors, life style, age, the population character, race, ethnicity and social income. The authors should describe the results observed in this study just in these circumstances.

In the section of Methods- Study population, it has been clarified that there was no significant difference in age, race, ethnicity, socioeconomic variables and living standards among the study population.

- p value in p10 line 13 should be written in lower case.

Thank you for your observation. The p-value has been written in lower case. In the revised manuscript, the sentence has been written as follows:

Females with *C. albicans* colonisation had higher levels of IgG (µg)/mg protein (*p*<0.001) and total protein concentration (*p*<0.05) compared to males with *C. albicans*.

- IgG (µg)/mg protein should be written throughout the paper including figure legends, not written as IgG/mg protein.

IgG (µg)/mg has been written throughout the paper including figure legends. IgA/µg protein has also been written in the same manner throughout the manuscript, that is, IgA (µg)/mg.

- In the Fig 2(a), at the T2D with C alb panel the column of salivary IgG(µg)/mg has no sign of p value, however in the results section the author describe *p*<0.001. Further the column of salivary IgA(µg)/mg has # which means *p*<0.001. The authors should indicate the subject to be compared versus #.
In the Fig 2(a), at the T2D with C alb panel the column of salivary IgG (μg/mg) the sign of p-value (#) has been high-lightened. According to the Reviewers’ recommendation, we have indicated that the sign (#) and its associated p-value (p<0.001) is a comparison of salivary IgG (μg/mg) among type 2 diabetic males and females with oral C. albicans colonisation.

- **P10 line 20** In the results section the authors describe “IgA/μg protein levels were 463.9 μg/mg (range 155-1489 μg/mg) and 319.8 μg/mg…”, however, in the figure male have around 370 μg/mg and female have around 390 μg/mg. Great discrepancy exists there.

Thank you for the observation. The IgA μg/mg values have been re-checked and entered in the text.

- **P10 line 21-22;** “Salivary total protein concentrations, in these individuals, were 2181 μg/mg (range 879.5-3812.3 μg/mg) and 3569.4 μg/mg (range 7-107.7 μg/mg) respectively.” The unit is different in the figure 2(b), it indicate mg/L instead of μg/mg. Which one is correct? Also the number 3569.4 is correct? The figure indicates around 2500.

Thank you for the observation. The value has been re-checked and corrected.

- **P11 line 2** 15.6 teeth (range 9-16) 15.6 is true mean?

The mean value has been re-checked and it was 15.58 which was rounded off to 15.6.

- **P11 line 10** These results are shown in Figure 3. How did you calculate the percentage of teeth present? Authors should describe it.

The methods used to calculate the percentage of present teeth has been entered in the methods as recommended. The percentage was calculated using the following formula:

\[
\text{Number of present teeth} \times 100
\]

\[
\frac{28}{28} \times 100
\]