Dear Editor,
We have been revised our manuscript according to the comments of reviewers and resubmitted. We have addressed each of the comments of the reviewers as follows,

Answers and changes according to the comments of the reviewer 1 as follows:

1-Abstract and Background section were rewritten based on your comments. More information on the relationship between apoptosis and periodontal diseases was be given in backround section and new references was added in sentences. The aim of the study was rewritten in last paragraph in backround section. We selected the GAP patients because there was study in chronic adult periodontal patients by Gamonal J, et.al. (J Periodontol April 2001,517-525) There were no studies in GAP patients in literature . We though that present study could be orginal.

2-Methods:
This section was re-organized (Patient selection, clinical examination, sampling of gingival tissue, laboratory procedures, statistical analysis........). Some terminology mistakes were improved. (e.g tissue collection-sampling of gingival tissue). The terminology of "A straight periodontal probe" was excluded from text. Statistical methodology and statistical test was included in statistical section. Clinical parameters represented the entire dentition. The study was patient-based. GAP patient had sites with PD [greater than or equal to]5 mm was chosen for biopsy. Tissue biopsies from the controls were obtained during routine dental treatment (tooth extraction and gingivoplasty).

3-Results
Aggresive periodontitis differs from the chronic form primarily by the rapid rate of disease progression seen in an healthy individual, an absence of large accumulations of plaque and calculus. The topic of "Demographic data" was replaced with "Mean clinical data" in Table 1 Minimum and maximum levels was not included in Table 1 since they could be caused a confusion in the evaluation of data. In addition to, significant differences were stated in table 1

4-Discussion
Discussion section was be rewritten via your comments. We interperted our results again. We hoped to answer your all comments in this section.

5- Conclusion
Conclusion section was be rewritten via your comments.

6- References:
New references which were related to the subject, were added

Answers and changes according to the comments of the reviewer 2 as follows:
1-Both abstract and backround section was rewritten based on your comments.
2-Informed consent has been obtained ferom both patients and the contol subjects was added in the methods section.
3-We selected the GAP patients because there was a study in chronic adult periodontal patients by Gamanal et.al. (J Periodontol April 2001,517-525) There were no similar studies in GAP patients in literature. We though that present study could be orginal.
4-Clinical parameters recorded for entire dentition.
5-The characteristics (systemic status, dru intake) of patients and control subjects was be described in methods section.
6-Biopsy samples contained both the epithelium and connective tissue.
7-In Table 2; Topic was changed, as "distribution of stained cells .......".
8-The correlation between clinical index and presence of markers was analyzed but there was no significant differences. Likewise the ratio of markers which apoptic/anti-apoptic protein was not significant results to discuss.
9- We interpreted our results again and the discussion was rewritten based on your comments.