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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

Our manuscript "Analysis of Proliferative Activity in Oral Gingival Epithelium in Immunosuppressive-Medication-Induced Gingival Overgrowth" was revised as far as possible according to the comments of reviewers. We have addressed each of the points raised by the reviewers as follows.

I- Revisions according to the comments of first reviewer:

First of all we thank you for your interest to our study. The answers and changes according to your comments as follows:

1- The hypothesis has been rewritten and well defined in the background section.

2- At page 4 in 5th paragraph: The reference number for Casasco et al has been put in square brackets.

3- In Methods, the sentence of 2nd paragraph: "None of the subjects were pregnant" has been changed to "None of the female subjects were pregnant".

II- Revisions according to the comments of second reviewer:

First of all we thank you for your comments and advices to our study. We have addressed each of the points raised by your comments as follows:

1- According to your comments the purpose of this study has been rewritten in the last paragraph of background section.
2- In Methods: "How many sites were measured within each sample in order to calculate the mean value?" Four sites were measured within each sample. "Which value was taken for the epithelial thickness; maximum epithelial thickness or mean epithelial thickness?" Finally mean epithelial thickness was taken for the epithelial thickness.

3- In Methods: " 'The field to be counted was chosen under X40 magnification from the well-labeled area'. What is the final magnification value?" The field to be counted was chosen under x40 magnification and then the final magnification value was x40.

4- In Methods, the sentence of last paragraph: "In addition, the mean value of the percentage of labeled cells to the total number of the cells in each gland was recorded as a gland proliferation index" has been removed from "method" section.

5- Minor essential revisions were also done in manuscript according to your comments.