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Author’s response to reviews:

Response letter

Dear reviewers or editors:

I would like to thank all the reviewers and editors for their constructive comments and suggestions to improve the quality of the manuscript. I have carefully addressed all reviewers’ and editors’ comments point by point.

Reviewer 2

Question: Given that there are different criteria for the diagnosis of PCOS (NIH, Rotterdam, Androgen Excess Society) I would like to know which were used in the study population and the stratification of the results according to criteria.

Answer: The reason why we choose three diagnose criteria (1990 NIH, 2003 Rotterdam, and 2006 AE-PCOS Society) for PCOS is that we want to find more references focused on the relationship between rs9939609 variants and PCOS according to the different criteria. However, all studies in our manuscript adopt Rotterdam criteria after data extraction (reference 12-16). Therefore only Rotterdam criterion was used in our study. So we not only analyzed four genetic
models in our manuscript, i.e., dominant model (AA + AT vs. TT), recessive model (AA vs. AT + TT), additive model (AA vs. TT) and allele model (A vs. T), but also analyzed subgroup classified by ethnicity.

I regret that the stratification of the results according to the other criteria can not be analyzed for the limited data.

Editorial proposal:

My point-by-point responses accompanied my revised manuscript are listed as follows:

1. I changed the affiliation of two authors. (Title page section, line 7-10, page 1).

2. I revised the some words’ spelling mistakes, for example, changing “genetype” into “genotype” (Selection of studies section, line 3 and 4, page 5; Data extraction and analysis section, line 3, page 6; Characteristics of included studies section, line 4, 5 and 6, page 7).

3. I revised the Declarations parts. For the “Ethics approval and consent to participate” section, I changed into “Not applicable”; For the “Consent for publication” section, I changed into “Not applicable”; For the “Availability of data and material” section, I changed the format according to the example: The datasets generated during and/or analyzed during the current study are available in the [NAME] repository, [PERSISTENT WEB LINK TO DATASETS],[Reference number]; For the “Authors’ contributions” section, I revised every authors’ contributions; For the “Acknowledgments” section, I also revised the content of this part. (Declarations section, all the content, page 10-11).

4. I moved the “list of abbreviations” from page 3 to page 10 (between “discussion” section and “declaration” section).

5. I changed the format of reference 20 according to editors’ email. (Reference section, reference 20, page 14)

We thank again to all the reviewers and editors for their thoughtful and thorough review.