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Dear Dr Veitch,

Thank you for your letter regarding our manuscript (ID - 1680894035185406) entitled "Genetic study of common variants at the Apo E, Apo Al, Apo CIII, Apo B, LP(a), lipoprotein lipase (LPL) and hepatic lipase (LIPC) genes and coronary artery disease (CAD): variation in LIPC gene associates with clinical outcomes in patients with established CAD"

We believe that we have answered to all the referees’ comments and have revised the manuscript accordingly.

Please find below all point-by-point answers to the referees.

Referee n. 1

1. We agree with the referee that our sample size is relatively small, but unfortunately, as mentioned in the text (page 7 par. 3 lines 4-5), only data on 60 subjects was available after 8 years of follow up. However, we would like to point out that, although the association between the LIPC gene and CAD has been previously reported, very few papers have reported results from follow up studies on this gene. This we think is the major point of interest of our paper, as also pointed out by this referee. In the discussion we have recognized the limited power of our study (page. 10, lines 13-15), and that it should be considered preliminary. We have also recognized that the results in the case control portion of the paper are confirmatory (page. 8 par. 3 lines 5-8).

2. As mentioned above, we had 60 subjects at follow up. Therefore, we were unable to analyse subsets of these patients, and had to consider the second CAD event as evidence of the progression of the atherosclerotic disease. This point has been further commented at pag.8 lines 1-3.

3. The abstract has been corrected as suggested (line 9).

Referee n. 3

1. We apologise for this mistake that was due to a typing errors. The correct mean age was 47.5 +/- 3.7, and the table has been corrected accordingly.
2. Designations of the p levels have been corrected.

3. "data not shown" has been deleted as suggested.

Marco Giorgio Baroni, MD PhD