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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editors,

(RE: MGTC-D-19-00001)

We would like to thank you very much for giving us the opportunity to revise our manuscript. We also appreciate editors and reviewers for their positive and constructive comments on our manuscript. We have studied the comments carefully and taken those comments into consideration in preparing our revision. The main corrections are in the manuscript and the responds to the reviewers’ comments are as follows.

Comments of editors

Comment 1: Informed consent to participate was not stated.

Response: We have added the statement of informed consent in the section of “Methods/patients sample”.

Comment 2: Indicate gene name for each SNP in title and other places: e.g. LRFN2.

Response: The main purpose of our study was to explore prognostic significance of SNPs, so we did not indicate the corresponding gene names in the title; meanwhile, we thought it could make the title a little bit more precise and concise. In addition, the gene names where SNPs located were specified in the discussion section and the detail information of SNPs were shown in Supplementary Table1.

Comment 3 and 4: Table 2 rs2494938 Additive 0.82 (0.77-1.64) 0.007. These are not correct! p and CI inconsistent. Table 2 based on 95% CI, none of 3 SNPs were significant, for any model. Please provide wald p values from cox model. Provide results (HR, CI, wald p) before adjustment and after adjustment with each significant variable. Discuss the discrepancies between them, and between cox and log-rank p values.

Response: We are very sorry for making such a simple mistake. To ensure that the correct P and CI values are provided, two researchers have independently calculated them again conforming to the applicable conditions with the same results. Then, results (HR, CI and P) before/after adjustment are made in Table 2. In discussion section, we have clarified the discrepancies among different model and between cox and log-rank p values.

Comment 5: Interpretation must be supported by the results.

Response: Based on the recalculated results in Table 2, we have rewritten the results section in more detail.

In addition, all the authors spent a lot of time in the final revision of the article, especially "Qiuzi Wang" who provided great help for our revise. Thus, we adjust the name of the third author "Qiuzi Wang" to the second author. At the same time, we have completed the "change of Authorship Form" which ensured that all authors sign this form. The Form has been sent to your email. Please pay attention to check your email.

We would like to express our great appreciation to you and reviewers for your hard work again. We'll look forward to hearing from you soon. Thank you and best regards.

Yours sincerely,
Yong Gao, M.D.
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