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Dear Editor,

Thank you for providing us with the opportunity to revise our manuscript "Serum S100B levels measured using two laboratory methods: a comparative, observational trial." Our responses to the reviewers' comments are presented below. We hope you will find the revised form of the manuscript acceptable for publication.

Yours sincerely,

Sharon Einav, MD

Response to Reviewer 1

Comment 1: "Introduction. The section is too long. I suggest the authors shorten it focusing on the aims of the study….there are studies that need to be cited (Nygaard Å et al. Clin Chem 1997;43:541 and Gazzolo D et al. Clin Chem 2003;49: 967-970.)"

Response: In accordance with the reviewer's suggestion this section has been shortened considerably and currently also cites the additional suggested studies (Introduction: page 5, paragraph 3, lines 20-21).

Comment 2: "Statistical Analysis. S100B protein in normal patients (fetus, newborn, pediatric and adult) has been shown to be age-dependent. Therefore, being population study admitted with an age at sampling ranging from 18 to 80 y, I suggest verifying S100B/age correlation in order to confirm previous observations."

Response: This has been performed and the results are presented in the revised version (Methods: page 8, paragraph 2, lines 4-8). Our findings support the findings described in adults by other investigators (Results: page 9, paragraph 1, lines 1-3 and Figure 3). This has been noted in the discussion along with the appropriate references.
Comment 3: "Discussion. This section needs to be improved reporting the effective difference in costs according to different measurement methods."

Response: This has been amended. In the revised version a whole paragraph in the discussion has been dedicated to this issue. (Discussion: page 11, paragraph 2, lines 6-25 and Table)

Response to Reviewer 2:

Comment: "Other recent and specific works have been reported about this issue (e.g. Mussack et al, 2006, Clinical Biochemistry, 39:349-356)."

Response: This comment has now been addressed in the discussion (Discussion: page 9, paragraph 3, lines 14-22). Once again, we wish to thank the editor for giving us the opportunity to revise and improve our manuscript.