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Reviewer’s report:

General
My comments have been answered.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

None.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

To avoid any potential confusion, the authors might want to change “difference (p<0.1)” to “difference for p<0.1” in two sentences, because the p value was 0.1.

“The observed tendency to increased total cholesterol and elevated BMI in Thr54 carriers, even though not significant for p<0.1, could be worth…” in Abstract (line 9, page 2) and “…carrier individuals (17/97) than non-carriers (10/105). This not significant difference for p<0.1, but…” in Results (line 24, page 5).

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

I wonder if information in the authors’ response could be incorporated in the revision: (1) “We analyzed the five markers in male Thr54 carriers respect to female Thr54 carriers. We did not find any significant difference (for p=0.05) between gender for BMI, cholesterol, blood pressure, and glycemia.” [Response 2 to Major comment] in the Results section and (2) “In 202 subjects, there were only 11 diabetics (5 Thr54 carriers, and 6 non-carriers).” [Response 1 to Minor comment] in the Methods-Subjects section.

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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