Dear editor,

Thank you, this is really good news. Again we revised the manuscript as suggested by Professor Satoshi Horai. Each criticism is discussed below. We have also addressed the editorial requests and conducted a final check up of the analysis. We did find some minor changes. We have sent you a copy of the document indicating all the final changes in a separate email with an attached pdf document addressed directly to Emma Veitch. Finally ethical approval was received from the ethics committee of the Mackay Memorial hospital in Taipei. This is now mentioned in the Methods section.
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Marie Lin
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Minor Compulsory revisions:
1. In the Results of the Abstract (p. 1), ?At First, when ?? should be ?At first, when ??.

Answer: Corrected.

2. On p. 4, lines 22-24, the authors should explain more completely (not clear): which control group is used., and what means ?diminished significance? because all of the four alleles have no significant association in any comparisons with the corrected P-values (Table 2)?

Answer: Corrected.
Answer: This section has been rearranged as:

The remaining 5 cases, labeled "Deceased or intubated probable SARS patients" in table 4, were retained for the analysis on the severity of SARS. The association of HLA class I and the severity of SARS was evidenced by an important increase of the odds ratio of HLA-B*4601 in the deceased or intubated probable SARS patient group against all other groups, notably with the 28 excluded fever patients (OR= 7.83, P=0.007, P≤=n.s.) and with control A (OR= 10.62, P= 0.0008, P≤ = 0.0279) (table 4). HLA-B*5401 and HLA-B*3901/B39 did not show association with the severity of SARS infection (data not shown).

3. On p. 4, line 7 from the bottom, please remove ?Although?.

Answer: Removed

4. On p. 6, one reference (no. 18) still needs to revise; ?Imanishi T?, not ?Imanish T?.
Answer: Corrected to Imanishi