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Reviewer's report:

General

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

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

The purpose of this study must be rewritten. It could not be to compare mitotic activity of keratinocytes in normal gingiva and in cyclosporine A induced gingival overgrowth (CsA-induced GO), since the investigators were evaluating proliferative index rather than mitotic index. Moreover, the gingiva obtained from the control subjects could not be classified as normal gingiva in view of the fact that control tissue samples were obtained from the inflamed gingiva from systemically healthy subjects with gingivitis.

Methods

Since epithelial thickness changes based upon the the region measured, an explanation should be given for the following questions. Which value was taken for the epithelial thickness; maximum epithelial thickness or mean epithelial thickness (How many sites were measured within each sample in order to calculate the mean value?)

'The field to be counted was chosen under X40 magnification from the well-labeled area'. What is the final magnification value?

What do the authors suggest by using the terms 'the total number of the cells in each gland' and 'gland proliferation index'?

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

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Results

2nd paragraph: ‘….with regard to PCNA and epithelial thickness’. PCNA expression should be used.

Discussion

3rd paragraph, last sentence. ‘our finding that mitotic activity…….’ should be changed to ‘our finding that proliferative activity….’

Conclusions

First sentence ‘………increased mitotic activity should be changed to increased proliferative activity’
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

**What next?:** Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.