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November 15, 2014

Dr. Sergi Castellvi-Bel. Hospital Clinic, Centre Esther Koplowitz, Spain

RE: Associations Between Variants on ADIPOQ and ADIPOR1 with Colorectal Cancer Risk: a Chinese Case-control Study and updated Meta-analysis

Dear Dr. Sergi,

Thank you for your letter dated on November 4, 2014 regarding the review of our aforementioned manuscript. We appreciate the comments from you and the reviewers, and have found the comments and suggestions helpful in preparation of the revised manuscript. We are glad to hear that our reports could be accepted for publication on BMC Medical Genetics if we carefully revised our manuscript. According the suggestions of you and the reviewers, we have revised our manuscript and hope these could meet your and the reviewers’ criteria. The following are our responses to the comments and suggestions.

Responses to Reviewer 1 (Pro. Ceres Fernandez-Rozadilla)

1. For #Q3: “Under results for genotyping, the authors declare that the T allele carriers at the rs1342387 marker have an 24% decreased risk of CRC with respect to the controls. Please explain how that decrease was calculated”, the authors cite a
typing error and that the decreased risk is indeed 26%. Calculating the percentage of risk variation is quite straightforward when OR > 1, but however, when OR < 1, the scale of the risk variation is different (it ranges from 0-1, as compared to the former, which ranges from 1 to infinity). Therefore, the calculation is different. In this case, we must consider the inverse of the OR to perform the calculations. This needs to be corrected in the manuscript before submission.

Response: We agree with the reviewer’s opinion. To correct the mistakes and make the sentences are easily to understand, we have deleted the number in our manuscript and hope it will meet the reviewer’s criteria.

2. - #Q4: I do agree with the authors that codependence (LD) between markers is very high, and thus the number of markers is not necessarily a correction factor for multiple testing, but they are indeed performing both 2 types of logistic regression, as well as 2 inheritance models and adjustment for multiple case-scenarios in which different sets of covariates are included, thus correction for multiple testing needs to be addressed in the manuscript if only to reflect on this.

Response: The reviewer gave valuable suggestions. We have provided the multiple testing correction results with the False Discovery Rate (FPR) method in our revised manuscript. We also discussed the LD between the markers in the discuss section of our manuscript and hope these will meet the reviewer’s criteria.

Responses to Reviewer 2 (Pro. Hilal Ozdag):
1. The necessary changes were done in the revised manuscript.

Response: Thank you very much for your positive opinion on our study. We have further revised our manuscript and hope it will improve the manuscript.

Thank you for your considering, and we hope the responses will meet your and the reviewers’ criteria.

Please send all correspondences to me at the following address:

Hui Wang, M.D., Ph.D.
Professor, Institute for Nutritional Sciences
Shanghai Institutes for Biological Sciences
Chinese Academy of Sciences
Rm 2204, The New Biology Science Building A#
320 Yueyang Road
Shanghai, 200031
People’s Republic of China
E-mail: huiwang@sibs.ac.cn
+86-21-54920941 (Phone)
+86-21-54920291 (Fax)
Sincerely,
Hui Wang, M.D., Ph.D.

Professor, INS, SIBS, CAS