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Cover Letter

Uberlândia, June, 15th, 2014

Dear Editor Dr. Thomas Stamm,

We have pleasure in submitting our revised version of the manuscript Ms. No 1810312171116264 entitled “Biocompatibility of three bioabsorbable membranes assessed in FGH fibroblasts and human osteoblast like cells culture” to Head & Face Medicine. This manuscript is being submitted exclusively to Head & Face Medicine, and is not being considered for publication in any other journal at present. The authors of this study confirm that it has not been published previously. This manuscript, in its revised form, has been read and approved by all authors. We place ourselves at your disposal for any further information you may require, and thank you for your kind attention.

Reviewer: Tiziano Testori

Reviewer's report:

Dear Authors, I think your paper is interesting and worth reading. Anyway, as it is, the English form is poor. There are many grammar and spelling mistakes. I suggest a professional English language correction.

Author's response: Authors agree and acknowledge all the reviewer’s comments regarding the content, structure and English language used in the text. The English language was revised by a native speaker.
Reviewer: Adrian Kasaj

Reviewer's report:

1.) **Abstract**: What are mouth fibroblasts? Do you mean human gingival fibroblasts?

**Author’s response**: The authors used gingival fibroblasts. The sentences were modified on text.

2.) This manuscript is difficult to read and needs some extensive editing for the English language.

**Author’s response**: Authors agree and acknowledge all the reviewer’s comments regarding the content, structure and English language used in the text. The English language was revised by a native speaker.

3.) Introduction: Please focus on guided tissue regeneration or guided bone regeneration, but don’t mix it together.

**Author’s response**: The authors agree and acknowledge the reviewer’s comment, all terms “guided bone regeneration” were changed to “guided tissue regeneration”.

4.) What was the purpose of including a PLA-based membrane in the study?
**Author's response:** The aim of this study was to analyze the behavior of bioabsorbable membranes about cell’s proliferation and adhesion. Since PLA membrane is a kind of bioabsorbable and represent gold standard the authors decided to this international material to the national ones.

5.) A viability test was performed at 4h and 24h. This is a very short time period. It may be useful to look at cell viability at later time points.

**Author's response:** The time period was selected due to the purpose of analyzing the cell’s adhesive capacity and immediately proliferation. Therefore 04 and 24 hours are sufficient time period for this type of analysis. The authors agree that the reviewer’s suggestion is important for future studies.

6.) The evaluation of cell attachment to these membranes would improve the paper.

**Author's response:** The authors agree and acknowledge the reviewer’s comment. Cell attachment tests will be performed for next researches.

7.) Results: Figures would be easier for the reader to interpret the results.

**Author's response:** Authors acknowledge the comment; additional figures were inserted in the results section.
8.) Discussion: The discussion is too long and should be shortened.

**Author’s response:** Authors agree and appreciate the comment, discussion section have been shortened.