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To

Danielle Burgess, PhD
Assistant Scientific Editor
BioMed Central

Sub: Point by point reply to the reviewers’ comments

Dear Dr. Burgess,

Thank you very much for your support and co-operation in having our Ms. titled “Association Analysis of ADPRT1, AKR1B1, RAGE, GFPT2 and PAI1 gene polymorphisms with chronic renal insufficiency among Asian Indians with type-2 diabetes” reviewed by the experts in this area of work and for the very valuable comments and suggestions made by the reviewers. In this third round of revision, one of the reviewer’s had asked us for a few more minor revisions. We have been able to address all the issues raised by the reviewer. Corrections/Modifications made according to the reviewers’ comments are marked in blue in the revised Ms.

We hope that you find our Ms. worthy of publication in your esteemed journal.

Thank you

Sincerely

Thelma B.K.
Professor
Dept. of genetics
University of Delhi South Campus
New Delhi, India
Point by point reply to Reviewer: Ilja Nolte

Please note that the revisions made according to the reviewer’s comments are marked in blue in the revised Ms.

Minor essential revisions

1. In their reply to comment 3 Prasad et al. mentioned that this manuscript is a pilot study and that they are currently performing a genotyping study on a larger sample. I think that this is worth mentioning in the discussion, e.g. at p13 after line 266.
   
   Reply: A statement in this regard has been added in the revised Ms on P-13, lines 266-268.

2. The authors state that only one of the p-values of the Fisher’s exact test was incorrect (reply to comment 8). However, I cannot imagine that all the others are correct as the p-values differ very much. I seriously think there must be something wrong in the way Prasad et al. calculate this Fisher’s exact p-value.
   
   Reply: Sorry for the blunder. Though, the p-values of the Fisher's exact test were mostly correct, the p-values of the Pearson’s chi-square test were incorrect at some places. Corrected p-values have been inserted in table 3 of the revised Ms.

3. The OR of the interaction on p 11, line 219 is not within the confidence interval (a CI of 0.41-0.92 seems more likely). Check this!
   
   Reply: Corrected CI (95% CI 0.40-0.97) has been inserted in the revised Ms.

4. p11, lines 210-212: is the line 'Gene-gene interaction ... between TGFB1 and GFPT2 genes' not in contradiction with lines 210-211 on the same page? If so, remove this sentence. If not, please explain more clearly the meaning of this sentence.
   
   Reply: The sentence has been removed.
5. What is meant with the 'candidate variables with a P value < 0.05'on p9, line 169? Were these genetic polymorphisms or other confounding variables? If genetic polymorphisms, then this is not what they did according to p11, lines 206-211. If other confounding variables, please explain which variables.

Reply: Sorry for the mistake. “Candidate variables” referred to the genetic polymorphisms. However, the sentence was not correct and therefore has been replaced in the modified Ms by the following statement.

“Linear and multiple logistic regression (Backward) analyses were carried out to correlate various clinical parameters with genotypes, and gene-gene interactions between SNPs of different pathways. Additive inheritance model in multiple regression analysis was employed to test interaction between SNP pairs from different pathways.”

Discretionary Revisions

1. The abbreviation for odds ratio that was introduced was OR (p9, line 163). Use this throughout the manuscript and not O.R.

Reply: Done

2. For the HWE calculation I would suggest to state that if was 'based on genotyping 220 normal healthy individuals' instead of 'based on genotyping of 440 chromosomes of normal healthy individuals' (p8, line 158).

Reply: Done

3. p11, line 209: remove 'in'.

Reply: Done

4. p11, line 212: remove one of the 'based'.

Reply: Done