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Reviewer's report:
This is a review of the revision. I find most of the revisions acceptable. I still have one issue and I confess that I am not sufficiently proficient in the finer points of statistics to know if RR completely substitutes for percent of the variance. I like percent of the variance because it is so clear. If it is one or two percent it is clear the gene in question is a minor contributor to the total picture. If the percent of the variance is greater than 5 it would be clear this was a major gene for ADHD, something p values alone cannot do. The RR values the authors report seem quite significant but the error ranges are large thus I have no real feel for the percent of the variance. If the authors could do an r2 by squaring the regression, r, between the traits and the gene variant on the more robust findings it would provide, at least for me, a more clear cut answer to the percent of the variance these genes are playing in ADHD.
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