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Dear Editor,

We would like to re-re-submit our manuscript, entitled “Changes in serum vitamin D and PTH values using denosumab with or without bisphosphonate pre-treatment in osteoporotic patients: A short-term study”, for publication in BMC Endocrine Disorders.

Please find below our rebuttal letter containing point-by-point responses to the Reviewers’ comments.

We hope that the revised version is now suitable for publication in BMC Endocrine disorders. Thank you for your time and we are looking forward to your reply.

Sincerely,

Yukio Nakamura,

Reviewer #1's report

Version: 3  Date: 11 August 2015  Reviewer: Neil Gittoes  Reviewer's report: My original comments and queries been addressed

→Thank you very much for this generous decision.

Reviewer#2's report:

Version: 3  Date: 30 August 2015  Reviewer: Mark Cooper  Reviewer's report: Major compulsory revisions:

→Thank you very much for pointing out very serious mistakes. We awefully thank this reviewer. Also, we sincerely apologize for our simple, careless, and serious mistakes this time.

It is difficult to actually recommend any revisions since the paper is now dramatically different from the earlier version. All of the interesting (and controversial) findings have
had to be removed since they were not accurate. The manuscript now just describes well established physiology with no apparent novel findings.

As suggested to shorten the text, we extensively deleted parts which had not been supposed to be related to our data, then we revised the introduction and discussion. Thus, a sort of different impression of this manuscript, especially of the introduction and discussion, might give on this reviewer, however, the results and insistence of this study has not been changed. Figure1a. has been changed based on the baseline values, however, the data themselves have been the same as the ones before. In this regard, since the impression of figure 1a. has changed, we have put the original figure 1a. which we had firstly submitted before revision. The manuscript title was based on the value changes of vitamin D and PTH. As shown in the title, the novel findings in this study were 1) the changes of serum vitamin D and PTH by denosumab treatment, and 2) thereby the changes of those values further changed by BP pre-treatment. We tried to explain these results of this study in the text using as many references as possible in the last version. Thus, we guess that this reviewer might have thought that our manuscript was descriptive. However, the reasons of a part of our findings suggest remain unknown.

2. There are still lots of errors in the text. Some new ones have been introduced. As a single example the levels of 1,25vitamin D in the serum of these patients appear to be lethal. I assume this is an error by the authors. It is hard for the reviewer to check every unit and, given that this is a revision, am not sure that the authors will be able to convince me in a revision that everything is correct without me double checking everything.

We sincerely apologize for our following simple but lethal mistakes. First, we mistook the Unit of figure1b and figure2c. In the figure1b, the Unit was changed from (nmol/L) to (pg/mL). In the figure2c, it was changed from (U/L) to (µg/L). We sincerely thank this reviewer for pointing out this important point and apologize for it. We have re-checked all of the data and the text in the manuscript. That is why it took longer time than expected. From now on, we swear that we will not have this type of mistakes anymore.

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
We have asked an English scientist, Mr. Trevor Ralph, to edit our manuscript whenever we submit. If needed, we will send it out one more time if you suggest someone.