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HNPPC FROM A SURGEON PERSPECTIVE: RETROSPECTIVE STUDY OF CLINICAL IMPACT OF MISMATCH REPAIR PROTEIN EXPRESSION ANALYSIS IN COLORECTAL CANCER PATIENTS LESS THAN 50 YEARS OLD

Dear Prof. Rowles

Many thanks for the attention and time You are giving to our paper. Let’s we send the latest answers to Your questions:

1) “Thank you for responding to our queries regarding your above submission to BMC Surgery. However, it appears that your only your cover letter, and not your revised manuscript, have been uploaded into our submission system. Could we ask you to please ensure that your manuscript is uploaded in the correct location? If you encounter any difficulties with this, or require any assistance, then please do let us know.”

Indeed we tried again via the website and we succeed in submit the text as well as the present cover letter; however, we have decided to send the files by direct mail too. Please let we know if the mail is arrived and what should we do thereafter

2) “In addition, we note from your cover letter that you have removed table 2 from your manuscript, as you do not have patient consent to publish this information. Could we ask you to clarify how important the information contained within this table is to reader comprehension of your study. Do you feel that they will still be able to properly assess your study without it? If not, then we would advise that you reinstate the table but remove all identifiable patient data from it.
Many thanks for this valuable suggestion. We do believe that You’re right in indicating a change in table 2 allowing for maintaining the table into the text without identifiable patients data; this table is indeed of some interest for the reader (even though it would be deleted without substantial problems, because the reported information are also described in the text). Anyway, we do prefer – but only after Your agreement – to change the column by 1 deleting sex and age of the single case (which is a not really important information, belonging all the patients to the group of cases less than 50 years old). The final version of the text is enclosed – revision was performed by the Word Reviser tool and revisions are further yellow-highlighted.

We are honored to submit our paper to BMC Surgery.

Many thanks in advance for Your attention.

Gian Luca Baiocchi,
on behalf of all the Authors