



DiVA – Digitala Vetenskapliga Arkivet <http://umu.diva-portal.org>

This is an author produced version of a paper published in **Journal of Oral Pathology & Medicine**

This paper has been peer-reviewed but does not include the final publisher proof-corrections or journal pagination.

Citation for the published paper:

Majid Ebrahimi, Karin Nylander and Isaäc van der Waal

Letter to the editor: Reply to H. M. Ögmundsdóttir & W. P. Holbrook by M. Ebrahimi et al.

Journal of Oral Pathology & Medicine, 2011, Vol. 40 issue: 9 pp 732

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0714.2011.01059.x>

Access to the published version may require subscription. Published with permission from:

Munksgaard

Dear Editor,

We have with interest taken part of the comments made by Ögmundsdóttir and Holbrook on our paper “Oral lichen planus and the p53 family: what do we know?”, published in *Oral Pathology and Medicine*, 2011; 40:281-285.

As Ögmundsdóttir and Holbrook correctly point out, there is unfortunately some inconsistency in reference numbers. This is entirely our fault and caused by late correction of the text, but not the reference list. We apologise for that.

Concerning Table 1 in our study, data on p53 expression in OLP and oral SCC is cited directly from Table 1 in the publication by Ögmundsdóttir *et al*, in *Eur J Oral Sci* from 2002. Table 1 in the study by Ögmundsdóttir *et al* does not include normal samples, which instead are presented in the text as "all 12 samples from normal oral mucosa (Fig 1E) contained occasional clearly TP 53-positive nuclei and were graded as 4". As all the normal samples thus express “clearly p53 positive cells”, it is correct to say that 100% of their normal samples did express p53 protein, as we do in our Table 1, even if the heading “p53 + samples of normal tissue”, and oral lichen planus and OSCC respectively, would have been more accurate to use for this particular study. The confusion concerning the data from Ögmundsdóttir *et al* in our Table 1 is rather that the positivity given for OLP and oral SCC only included grades 1 and 2. More correct would have been to include all grades of positivity for p53, excluding grade 6, giving figures for OLP of 98% and for oral SCC of 78% in the study by Ögmundsdóttir *et al*. That in our view is the inconsistency found in our Table 1.

Majid Ebrahimi

Karin Nylander

Isaac van der Waal