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To
The Editor
BMC Medical Genetics
Dear Sir,

Sub: On line submission of our manuscript entitled “Influence of advanced age of maternal grandmothers on Down syndrome”

With reference to the above, herein I am resubmitting revised version of our research paper along with the response to the reviewers report. We have attended to all the comments, suggestions and updated the manuscript accordingly.

I wish to bring to your kind notice in the following points with regards to the figures:

1) Reviewer, Prof. Mathias Forrester is of the opinion that the information in the manuscript which is being generated from the figures is already dealt in the Table 2 and 3. Therefore he suggested deleting the figures.

2) Reviewer, Prof. Bendix Carstensen, suggested generating new case-control-status data by using different variables for logistic regression. Accordingly we have generated the figure 2 and included in the manuscript.

3) In view of this, in the revised manuscript we have explained the importance of figures and Tables. Therefore we feel to retain the figures and Table as presented in the revised manuscript.

4) However, we will agree to your decision to retain or to delete the figures.

I hope you will consider our paper favorably.

Thanking you

Yours sincerely,

Nallur B. Ramachandra
RESPONSE TO REVIEWER’S REPORT

REVIEWER: Dr. Mathias Forrester

Thank you very much for your valuable suggestions. The suggestions have been attended and updated by including the suggestions of another reviewer also.

General

Abstract:

1) Some of the suggested sentences of the Results section are deleted and some of them are modified.

2) This was attended as suggested.

Background:

3) The suggestion was attended in the last Paragraph.

Methods:

4) Selection criteria of controls have been mentioned in the text.

Results:

5) As suggested, it has been included in the 6\textsuperscript{th} line of the last paragraph of the page 3. A part of it has been modified and retained in the first paragraph of the result section.

6) Table 1 and the accompanying text describing the number of children is essential to get the mean mother, father and grandmother age the importance of this has been discussed in page No. 7, new paragraph.

7) This point has been discussed in the text page No. 7, new paragraph, line No 9.

8) The information was modified and shifted to the discussion section.
9) a) Figure 1 gives a clear idea of the pattern of age distribution in the mother and grandmother. This also presents the order of the birth of DS children in the family. If the reviewer feels that the figure 1 has to be removed, we will agree to do the same.

b) Figure 2 was desired by one of the reviewers, which is again modified based on the suggestions. Logistic regression analysis was done with case-control-status as response variable and age of mother, father and grandmother as explanatory variables. Even if the reviewer feels that the figure 2 has to be removed, we will agree to do the same.

Discussion

10) This point has been attended in the last paragraph of page 9.

11) What has been written is right and is expected to retain it.

Conclusion:

12) Attended as suggested.

Minor essential revisions:

13) This point has been attended and corrected with consistent maternal age groups: 18-29 and 30& above in the manuscript.

13) Yes, table 3 is modified and as suggested the percentages has been included.

Discretionary Revisions:

15) No, the statement has been made in the conference, therefore, the reference in the manuscript is not included.

16) Yes, this point has been updated in the manuscript.

17) As suggested it has been shifted to page no 3, last paragraph of the background section.
RESPONSE TO REVIEWER’S REPORT

REVIEWER: Bendix Carstensen

Thank you very much for your valuable suggestions. The suggestions have been attended and updated by including suggestions of another reviewer also.

1) General remark:

As suggested by the reviewer, at the end of the background the aim of the manuscript has been updated.

2) Specific remarks

2.1 Data: As suggested by the reviewer (in the report as well as through email to my request) the data analysis has been done accordingly. A copy of the raw data generated as suggested by the reviewer also has been sent to him by email. We have done logistic regression only for the variables, age of mother, father and grandmother.

2.2 Statistical methods:

1) Sex of DS child cannot be a variable since there is no significant difference in the sex of Ds children which has been updated in the manuscript.

2.3 Note:

For the statistical analysis and interpretation, Professor and HOD of the Statistics department, University of Mysore, has been consulted and accordingly the data has been interpreted.