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To the Editor

We have revised our manuscript according to the suggestions by the reviewers.

**1st Reviewer: Dr Caroline Wilkinson**

Minor essential revisions (which the authors can be trusted to make)

Diploe is frequently referred to as "spongy" bone and I think that this should be included along with "cancellous" in the description.

*has been done.*

Please check that the diphong is necessary in diploe. Most common anatomy books (Gray's, Grants etc) include diploe without the diphong.

*has been changed to be without the diphong*

Page 2 line 5; no "a" necessary.
page 17 ref 15 needs space between name (Yoganadan) and initial (N).

*has been corrected.*

**2nd Reviewer: Prof Rolf Lehmann**

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1. p. 2, Results: line 2/3
The sentence ?Diploëic thickness was?bone thickness.? Should be supplemented by ?, except for the left euryon in females.?

*has been corrected*

2. p. 2, Conclusions
So far the major part of this section repeats results and gives some additional information. Only the last sentence contributes something to the meaning of your results. I think this section can easily be extended and thereby improved. Rewriting this paragraph would contribute to direct the reader?'s attention to the importance of your findings. You may consider the following suggestions:
Which meaning has your main finding (sexual dimorphism in diploëic thickness in the frontal region)?
How important are your findings in general, in your field, in related fields?
Which meaning do your results for clinicians, researchers and other professionals have?
Are your findings consistent/inconsistent with your earlier data and those of other authors?
Do you have any recommendations?
What remains unclear?
Is there a need for further specific studies?
A look at ?Conclusions? in other papers recently published in HEAD & FACE MEDICINE may be useful.

-We have rewritten our conclusion so as to reflect these suggestions. A paragraph has also been added to the full conclusion at the end of the manuscript.

3. According to Terminologica anatomica = International Anatomical Terminology, 1998 (the joint creation of the Federative Committee on Anatomical Terminology [FCAT] and the International Federation of Associations of Anatomists [IFAA]) the following terms should be used:

Fig. 1 Lamina externa or External table instead of Outer diploëic layer
   Diploë or diploe instead of Trabecular layer
   Lamina interna or Internal table instead of Inner diploëic layer

Compare also p. 8, line 2

-has been corrected throughout, including labelling in figure 1.

--------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
p. 6, and others euryon instead of Euryon
p. 8, space bar: [6, 30] instead of [6,30]
p. 12, Table 2. instead of TABLE 2:
p. 13, Table 3. instead of TABLE 3:
p. 18, space bar: the human instead of thehuman

-everything has been corrected

Your sincerely

Niels Lynnerup
Asc. Professor, MD, PhD
n.lynnerup@antrolab.ku.dk