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Dear Drs. Neilan and Alam:

Thank you very much for the latest comments regarding our manuscript entitled "Elevated MED28 expression predicts poor outcome in women with breast cancer" by Nam K Yoon et al. We appreciate the further comments by Dr. Turashvili, they were quite helpful. We feel we have addressed all of her points and questions (see below).

If you have any questions or concerns, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Lee Goodglick

Associate Professor,
Director, UCLA EDRN
Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine
UCLA School of Medicine
Center for the Health Sciences
10833 Le Conte Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90095
Reviewer: Gulisa Turashvili

Minor Essential Revisions

1 & 2. Dr. Turashvili's comments were excellent and quite helpful. Upon re-reading our manuscript, I would agree with her that the our description of the TMA was confusing. Therefore, I have done the following to address all her questions and make the description more complete and more "user friendly".

a) I have re-written the description in Methods regarding the cases and spots represented on the TMA. I have both expanded this section and hopefully made it easier to read. I believe that these revisions address all the questions that Dr. Turashvilli made in comments #1 and #2 of her latest review (including, point #2 regarding the number of metastases that were to the lymph nodes).

b) In addition, I have added another figure (Figure 1) which now in flowchart form details which cases were included and excluded in our outcomes analyses.

Again, I appreciate Dr. Turashvilli's comments. We are in total agreement that our primary goal is to present our study in a complete, easy-to-understand fashion. I think that the combination of a clearer / more complete Methods section combined with the flow chart in Figure 1 has accomplished this (as a side-note, I think these changes might be clearer than an additional table). However, if there are still subsection that remain unclear, certainly contact me.

3. We have now cited Figure 2G (old Figure 1G) in the text