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Author's response to reviews: see over
The comments and requestings of the referees and the amendments of the authors:

Referee 1 (Xiaojun Liu):

1. In the section of “abstract”, a space is missing between “morbidity” and “Squamous cell”.
   - A space was created between “morbidity” and “Squamous cell”.

2. In the “introduction”, a space is absent between “fourth” and “Delay in diagnosis.”
   - The required changes were made.

3. In case 1, “accumulated” should be replaced by accumulated.
   - The required changes were made.

4. In case 3, in total, 3 space are missing.
   - The required changes were made.

5. In conclusion and author’s contributions, there is some mistake on comma.
   - Some mistake on comma was corrected.

Referee 2 (Luis Gaitan Cepeda):

The aim of the paper is aware to dentist for an early diagnosis of oral cancer. The authors strongly recommend a close follow up of patients with oral cancer diagnosis, however in any of their cases is show the follow up, treatment or survival time.

- We highlighted the aware of dentist for an early diagnosis of oral cancer. We are working in dentistry faculty and also we have got oral and maxillofacial surgery clinic. But according to faculty policy, if any patient referred to our clinic or diagnosed in our clinic with metastatic malignancy lesions, the patient refers to oncology hospitals for advanced head and neck dissection surgery or radiotherapy if needed chemotherapy. We presented this issue in terms of the delay diagnosis because of the lack knowledge of general dentists. We added the information in conclusion part about the dentist follow-up of patient in diagnosis period.

- The language was controlled.

Referee 3 (Zohreh Dalirsani):

1) It is suggested that add “cases series” to key words.
   - The suggestion was made.

2) Reference should be added to third sentence of introduction.
- Reference was added to third sentence of introduction.

3) Some words should be changed such as: tretment(treatment) ,
systemical(systemic), maxiler(maxillary), localised(localized), lenf(lymph),…
-Required changes was carried out.

4) In cases: grade of SCC and the size of the lesion and treatment and follow up
should be mentioned.

- The grade of SSC and the size of the lesion have been expressed. We added the
information in conclusion part about the dentist follow-up of patient in diagnosis period.
Because, the treatment and the follow-up processes are being carried out by the state
oncology hospital.

5) In case 2: the examination of lymph nodes should be explained.
- Required addition was carried out.

6) It's better to reveal with which radiography technique expansion of bone was
recognized.
- We used firstly, conventional radiological techniques which were panoramic, occlusal etc...

7) Radiographic description should be completed and the borders of lesions (regular or irregular) be mentioned.
-Required additions were done in Case 1 and Case 2.

8) In the references: ref 1": it is better to replace with newer edition of the book: 2009.
-Required additions were done

9) In the first paragraph of discussion: the reference 7 is related to the article in 1989 and it is not suitable for the term :" recent years".
- The term "few decades" was added instead of the term "years".

10) And in the second paragraph "data from several reports …." Just one
reference is mentioned.
- Two references were added.

11) In the sentence of " survival ratio of head and neck cancer…" It is better to
"survival rate of SCC be mentioned and the references related to " survival rate of SCC" should be new.

-We added that " rate of squamous cell carcinoma" to the following sentences.

12) The paragraph about references "14 and 15", two references should be separated and every sentence should have one reference.

- The requested changes were made.

13) It is better to explain more about "aggressive therapy" in the end of discussion.

- The requested changes were made.

14) In the legend of pictures, more explanation is needed and the pictures should be referred in the text.

- The requested changes were made.

15) The English writing quality of this manuscript is unacceptable. The text should be grammatically revised.

- The necessary corrections were studied to make.