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Natural Prevalence of Antibodies to Spike Proteins of Four Non-SARS Human
Coronaviruses among a General Population in Beijing

Dear Editors,

Thank you very much for your consideration of our manuscript and request for a reversion.

Please find our point-by-point response to reviewers’ comments in “Responses to Reviewers’ Comments” below. As you will see, we have made every attempt to incorporate these suggestions as thoroughly as possible. Please note that the most of changes in the manuscript are correlated with the responses to reviewers’ comments as listed.

Sincerely,

Wenjie Tan, PhD, MD
Responses to Reviewers’ Comments

Major Compulsory Revisions

The description of the statistical approach is incorrect: the authors appear to just compare proportions and report p-values from that rather than using an ANOVA. However only significance is reported, not the actual p-values, so this makes it difficult to check the results.

A: Thanks! We addressed the comment by adding the actual p-values in the text (line 210-216, line 228).

Minor Essential Revisions

line 160—the authors probably mean "Tukey's" test, not "Turkey's" test, but it is not clear they have done this.

A: We have changed the “Turkey's” to “Tukey's”

line 170—how can 36.63% be described as a "majority"? Use a different term.

A: We have revised the statement as “and the majority of adults were 31 to 50 years of age (n = 363, 63.0%)” (line 171-172).

Discretionary Revisions

The data analysis should have used logistic regression to systematically test for an effect of gender and age group on seropositivity status.
A: We have used logistic regression to analyze the data (line 160-162). The result showed no difference than previous conclusion for an effect of gender and age group on seropositivity status.