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Author’s response to reviews:

I would like to express our thanks to the editors who gave important suggestion of revising our manuscript. Here is the revision.

From the authors' answer, one can guess now that the SNP of interest was not genotyped in the PROCARDIS and CARDIOGRAM but has to be imputed. This explains why the author could not use the corresponding exact genotype distribution and conduct dominant/recessive model analyses.

I will accept the modified version for publication if the authors agree to further clarify the "data extraction" section in a way such as :

" The first author, published year, country, study population, mean age of participants, gender distribution, study design, sample size, outcome, diagnostic criteria, genotyping method, characteristics of the controls, allele frequencies, and genotype distributions were extracted. In Procardis and Cardiogram, the studied SNPs were not available in the genome-wide genotyping assay and had to be imputed". please also give the corresponding imputation quality criteria.

We revised our data extraction part according to the editor’s suggestion:

“In PROCARDIS [25] and CARDIoGRAM [24], the studied SNPs were not available in the genome-wide genotyping assay and had to be imputed. The SNPs imputed with high quality (MACH_R2 > 0.3) were included in the analyses.“