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July 7, 2009

To the Editor

Re: MS: 6721038742771863

Thank you for the reviewers comments on our manuscript originally titled “Molecular Apocrine Breast Cancer: Gene Expression Meta-Analysis with Network Reconstruction Supports a Causal Role for Androgen Receptor and Implies Interactions with the ErbB Family” and now resubmitted with the revised title “Gene Expression Meta-Analysis Supports Existence of Molecular Apocrine Breast Cancer with a Role for Androgen Receptor and Implies Interactions with ErbB Family” according to reviewer 2’s suggestion (see attached document). We are pleased to note that there were no major revisions required for this resubmission. We have corrected the typographical errors noted by reviewer 1, who had no other suggested revisions. We have changed the title as suggested by reviewer 2. Both reviewer 1 and reviewer 2 indicated that the writing was acceptable. Reviewer 2 states that “Overall the manuscript is appropriate for publishing,” while suggesting some minor changes that would shorten the results section. We decided not to make any changes as it was considered overall acceptable and we felt making the changes suggested (removing mention of some of the approaches that were listed in the results) would remove important information that places the results in context.

We hope that you will find this revised manuscript satisfactory for publication as the reviewers’ comments indicated only minor revisions. We appreciate the time that they took to review our work and we thank them for their helpful comments. Details of the minor revision are in the attached document.

Sincerely,

Sandeep Sanga, M.S.
Bradley M. Broom, Ph.D.
Vittorio Cristini, Ph.D.
Mary E. Edgerton, M.D., Ph.D.
Re: MS: 6721038742771863

Reviewer 1

Reviewer 1 has listed minor revisions to correct typographical errors which we have corrected:
page 10, last sentence: WE -> We and discuss -> discuss
page 11 first sentence of 3rd paragraph: cell ines -> cell lines and hypothesis -> hypothesize.

Reviewer 2 in Comment 8 suggested that we change the title to “Meta-Analysis of Gene Expression supports the existence of Molecular Apocrine Breast Cancer and the Participation of AR.”

Based upon this recommendation, we have changed the title from “Molecular Apocrine Breast Cancer: Gene Expression Meta-Analysis with Network Reconstruction Supports a Causal Role for Androgen Receptor and Implies Interactions with the ErbB Family” to “Gene Expression Meta-Analysis Supports Existence of Molecular Apocrine Breast Cancer with a Role for Androgen Receptor and Implies Interactions with ErbB Family”. We have retained the mention of the implied interactions with the ErbB Family in the title because there is a great deal of interest in these interactions in the breast cancer community and we want readers to know that our analyses do implicate interactions with ErbB activity (e.g. your recently featured article “Role of GF in breast cancer prognosis”, BMC Medical Genomics 2009, 2:3).

Reviewer number 2 in Comment 9 indicated that the writing was acceptable, although he suggested that “The results could use shortening and some of the approached could be moved to the methods. Pathway figures are not terribly compelling and could be safely removed.”

We do have some methodology mentioned in the results, essentially where we are either comparing results from different methods or where we explain why we are using one method or another. We considered following the suggestion of Reviewer 2 here, and we appreciate the comment; however, we found that without the mention of methods the results were presented without sufficient context. We note that Reviewer 1 found the writing acceptable. In the same regard, we have also kept the pathway figures.