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Author’s response to reviews:

Technical Comments:

Title page

-Please include the email addresses for all authors on the title page. The corresponding author should still be indicated. Please also ensure these email addresses match the email addresses provided in the editorial manager system.

Response: Thanks for your comment. We have added the email information in the title page.

Consent to publish

-We note that you have not included a ‘Consent for publication’ section in the Declarations. Consent for publication refers to consent for the publication of identifying images or other personal or clinical details of participants that compromise anonymity. Seeing as this is not applicable to your manuscript please state “Not Applicable” in this section.

Response: Thanks for your comment. We have added the relative information.

Acknowledgement

-We note that you have not included an acknowledgements section in the Declarations. If you have no acknowledgements, please put ‘Not Applicable’ in this section.

Response: Thanks for your comment. We have added the relative information.
Angela T. Alleyne, Ph.D. (Reviewer 1): The authors provide a generally well written meta-analysis on the relationship of rs1695 in GSTP1 and various Squamous cell carcinomas. The theoretical and methodological approaches are acceptable and appropriate. However, there is an analytical error, some minor grammatical errors and methodological areas that are of concern. These are outlined below.

1. The title is misleading since it is a meta-analysis of 52 case control studies, and this should be included in the title of the study.

Response: Thanks for your comment. We have revised this point, according to your very useful suggestion.

2. The introduction lacks any reference to metanalyses for GSTP1. Instead the authors show the conflicting data in GWAS studies on the rs1695 polymorphism. While this is acceptable, they should indicate the use of metanalyses in prior studies on GSTP1 because this is a metanalysis and not an experimental case control GWAS study. This seems to have been done on the discussion (page 6, second paragraph). Therefore, I believe some mention of metanalysis should be correctly placed in the introduction so that one is aware of type of study under investigation.

Response: Thanks for your comment. We have revised this point, according to your very useful suggestion.

3. Throughout the paper the authors refer to "literatures", this should be corrected to "literature searches".

Response: Thanks for your comment. We have revised this point, according to your very useful suggestion.

4. In the results section, if 597 literature searches were used as stated in the text, then a total of 215 not 115 full text articles is what was correctly assessed for eligibility and not 115 as stated. However, in figure 1 the authors show a total of 497 texts were searched not 597, 168 duplicates removed and a further 214 excluded which correctly means 115 were assessed. This is very important and needs to be corrected in the text.

Response: Thanks for your comment. We are very sorry for our stupid mistake. It should be 497 literature searches, but not 597. We have revised this point. Thanks for your nice comment again.

5. In the results section, the authors also provide no explanation of removal of 68 of these articles from the 115 selected based on their exclusion criteria as stated in the methods section. This needs some clarification.
Response: Thanks for your comment. Based on your very useful suggestion, we have added the necessary information in the method section. The detailed information for the removal of 68 was shown in Figure 1.

6. Page 8 replace "evidences" with "evidence" and rephrase the sentence.

Response: Thanks for your comment. We have revised this point, according to your very useful suggestion.

Dear Prof. Angela T. Alleyne,

Thanks for your nice comments. Apart from the above, we found a mistake after checking our analysis process. That is, the SCC type in the study [Jourenkova, et al. 1998] should be LSCC, rather than HNSCC. Thus, we have corrected and re-analyzed this point. New Figure 2 was provided. In addition, our revised manuscript has also been modified by the Nature Research Editing Service (http://bit.ly/NRES_BS).

Best regards,

Zhijie Bai

Shinya Nishio (Reviewer 2): The manuscript entitled "Glutathione S-Transferase Pi 1 variant and squamous cell carcinoma risk, based on 52 case-control studies" showed negative results in association between GSTP1 gene polymorphism and SCC. All the manuscripts are well written and data analysis was appropriate. This result is negative result but useful data for association study in SCC.

Response:

Dear Prof. Shinya Nishio,

Thanks for your comment. Our revised manuscript has also been modified by the Nature Research Editing Service (http://bit.ly/NRES_BS).

Best regards,

Zhijie Bai
If improvements to the English language within your manuscript have been requested, you should have your manuscript reviewed by someone who is fluent in English. If you would like professional help in revising this manuscript, you can use any reputable English language editing service. We can recommend our affiliates Nature Research Editing Service (http://bit.ly/NRES_BS) and American Journal Experts (http://bit.ly/AJE_BS) for help with English usage. Please note that use of an editing service is neither a requirement nor a guarantee of publication. Free assistance is available from our English language tutorial (https://www.springer.com/gb/authors-editors/authorandreviewertutorials/writinginenglish) and our Writing resources (http://www.biomedcentral.com/getpublished/writing-resources). These cover common mistakes that occur when writing in English.

Response: Thanks for the comment. Our revised manuscript has also been modified by the Nature Research Editing Service (http://bit.ly/NRES_BS).

Editorial Policies: Please read the following information and revise your manuscript as necessary. If your manuscript does not adhere to our editorial requirements, this may cause a delay while this is addressed. Failure to adhere to our policies may result in rejection of your manuscript. In accordance with BioMed Central editorial policies and formatting guidelines, all manuscript submissions to BMC Medical Genetics must contain a Declarations section which includes the mandatory sub-sections listed below. Please refer to the journal's Submission Guidelines web page for information regarding the criteria for each sub-section (https://bmcmedgenet.biomedcentral.com/).

Where a mandatory Declarations section is not relevant to your study design or article type, please write "Not applicable" in these sections. For the 'Availability of data and materials' section, please provide information about where the data supporting your findings can be found. We encourage authors to deposit their datasets in publicly available repositories (where available and appropriate), or to be presented within the manuscript and/or additional supporting files. Please note that identifying/confidential patient data should not be shared. Authors who do not wish to share their data must confirm this under this sub-heading and also provide their reasons. For further guidance on how to format this section, please refer to BioMed Central's editorial policies page (see links below).

Declarations

- Ethics approval and consent to participate
- Consent to publish
- Availability of data and materials
- Competing interests
- Funding
- Authors' Contributions

- Acknowledgements

Response: Thanks. We have checked these points in our revised manuscript.

Further information about our editorial policies can be found at the following links:

Ethical approval and consent:

http://www.biomedcentral.com/about/editorialpolicies#Ethics

Availability of data and materials section:

http://www.biomedcentral.com/submissions/editorial-policies#availability+of+data+and+materials

Recipients of this email are registered users for this journal. In line with data privacy directives, we will remove your personal information from the journal's database upon your request. Where the journal's database is shared with companion journals, this will be all-inclusive. Database sharing is indicated at the journal's homepage. At removal, your personal identifiers are hashed and your account is deactivated. We will be unable to reinstate your account history. The history of past manuscript progress is retained scholarly record, and may only be retrieved post-archiving, for official investigation, in line with COPE practices. Once your account is removed, you are no longer known to the journal. As such, it will be possible for journal Editors to re-register you anew, if your contact details and expertise are found in the public record. You will always be notified of a (re)registration, prior to invitation to participate. If you prefer that the journal persistently recalls your wish to not be contacted for invitations to participate, please indicate this. This may be accommodated as a service provision, but necessitates that we maintain a record of your registration details and preference for no-contact. Publication office:

PublicationOfficeSPI@springernature.com If you would like your personal information to be removed from the database, please contact the publication office

Response: Thanks