

Tuesday, May 06, 2014

Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed the edited manuscript in Word format (file name: 2429-review.docx).

**Title:** Host-derived biomarkers in gingival crevicular fluid for complementary diagnosis of apical periodontitis

**Author:** Garrido Mauricio., Dezerega Andrea, Castro-Martínez Alfredo and Hernández Marcela,

**Name of Journal:** *World Journal of Stomatology*

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 9953-edited

We deeply appreciate the effort and time invested to revise and improve our manuscript. First of all, we need to apologize for uploading a previous draft of the manuscript resulting in the mistakes you observed. Uploaded you will find the final version of the manuscript thoroughly revised and considering all the reviewer`s comments. The specific changes in the text are highlighted in blue.

Rev1. The paper is interesting but I suggest sending the manuscript to a professional English editing system. In summary, I recommend review carefully the paper and resubmit.

*The paper has been thoroughly revised for English writting.*

Rev. 2.

The paper is interesting for a new potential diagnostic approach to apical periodontitis. It is simple and clear, however revising the manuscript in various parts it's mandatory. Provisional notes (page 1 ,2nd row -insertar 2° apellido; page 6 row 19 Shin???; page 7 Garrido PIRO)are still typed , the abstract (except for the title) is completely missing,the article format do not provide discussions\conclusions as a separate session and everything is enclosed in the introduction. Sections, according to the instructions to authors, should be clearly defined. Furthermore an adjustment is required for some terms too literally translated from Spanish: maybe potential diagnostic tool is more apt than side-tool(and the same every time "side-" is mentioned in the text). I think the paper should be considered for publication only after a resubmission with all the above mentioned corrections.

*We have checked one by one the above mentioned observations and apologize for the mistakes. Unfortunately, we uploaded a previous draft of the manuscript without noticing until now. As the article corresponds to a short review, we did not organize it into the*

*classic components of an original research article, but the aims and conclusions have been separated. The specific proposed changes were highlighted in blue text.*

The Manuscript showed original and interesting data and it is suitable for the publication.

Author instructions must be adhered to, can be considered for publication after revision.

*We have carefully checked the instructions to authors, and the format was adjusted.*

*Regarding to the references we were not able to open the link, we would deeply appreciate recommending a defined end note format.*

Rev. 4. The Manuscript showed original and interesting data and it is suitable for the publication.

Sincerely yours,

Associate Professor Marcela Hernández R.

PhD, MSc, specialist in Oral Pathology

Head of the Department of Oral Pathology and Medicine Faculty of Dentistry

Universidad de Chile.