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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

Thank you very much for your attention and the referee’s evaluation and comments on our paper MGTC-D-18-00016R1 and advice on our manuscript. We have revised the manuscript according to your kind advices and referee’s detailed suggestions. Enclosed please find the responses to the referees. We sincerely hope this manuscript will be finally acceptable to be published on BMC Medical Genetics. Thank you very much for all your help and looking forward to hearing from you soon.

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours

Dr Ying-ying Luo

Adrià Aterido (Reviewer 1): The authors of the present manuscript have addressed most of the comments raised in the initial revision. However, there is still one comment that should be addressed:

1.2 Knowing the number of HBV-positive patients from each study included in the meta-analysis would help to rule out that the two stratified analysis are redundant. This could also help to
discard that HBV-patients included in the meta-analysis are taken from only one or a very few studies (in such a case, the concept meta-analysis would be strongly compromised). This data was not present in the original manuscript and remains still hidden in the revised manuscript. It should be shown in Table 1.

The authors’answer: Thank you very much for your suggestion. The number of HBV-positive cases/controls from each study included in the meta-analysis was shown in Table 1.

Hui-Ping Yuan (Reviewer 3): The author has done an updated meta-analysis about association between KIF1B rs17401966 genetic polymorphism and hepatocellular carcinoma susceptibility. The results are reasonable and the reviewers' comments have been answered.

However, I have some comments as below:

1. Title: "meta-analysisism" should be "meta-analysis".

The authors’answer: Thank you very much for your suggestion. We have changed the "meta-analysisism" in the title to "meta-analysis".

2. Due to the high heterogeneity of the result, a sensitive analysis could be conducted to try to find out the source of the heterogeneity.

The authors’answer: Thank you very much for your suggestion. Sensitivity analysis was performed by removing the studies in the meta-analysis to evaluate the effects of individual case-control study on the meta-analysis results by Stata 14.0 (Supplemental Figure 1, 2, 3, Supplemental Table 1, 2, 3). We have failed to find out the source of the heterogeneity by the sensitivity analysis. The corresponding pooled OR were not changed when any single study was removed, indicating that the statistical results did not suggest significant effects, revealing the stability and credibility of the results. We have added the results of the sensitive analysis in our manuscript as follow.

Sensitivity analysis was performed by removing the studies in the meta-analysis to evaluate the effects of individual case-control study on the meta-analysis results by Stata 14.0. The corresponding pooled OR were not changed when any single study was removed, indicating that the statistical results did not suggest significant effects, revealing the stability and credibility of the results.

Finally, we appreciate very much for your time in editing our manuscript and the referees for their valuable suggestions and comments. I am looking forward to hearing from your final decision when it is made.