Author’s response to reviews

Title: Association of NTCP polymorphisms with clinical outcome of hepatitis B infection in Thai Individuals

Authors:

Natthaya Chuaypen (natthaya.ch56@gmail.com)
Nongnaput Tuyapala (nongnaput34@hotmail.com)
Nutcha Pinjaroen (fon_nutch@hotmail.com)
Sunchai Payungporn (medbiochemcu@gmail.com)
Pisit Tangkijvanich (pisittkvn@yahoo.com)

Version: 2 Date: 24 Apr 2019

Author’s response to reviews:

Dear the editors

We appreciate the opportunity to submit a revision of our manuscript entitled “Association of NTCP polymorphisms with clinical outcome of hepatitis B infection in Thai Individuals” (MGTC-D-18-00503R1) for publication in BMC Medical Genetics. It is gratifying that the editor/reviewer consider our study has improved considerably following the reviewers’ suggestion and is potentially acceptable for publication.

Please find the revised manuscript with changes highlighted in red or blue colors, as well as a point-by-point response to the reviewers’ comments. Please also see the response to the editor’s comments.

This manuscript is not currently under consideration elsewhere, and all authors have approved the submission of this manuscript for publication in BMC Medical Genetics.

Thank you for considering this revised manuscript. We look forward to your kind reply.

Best regards,

Pisit Tangkijvanich, M.D.

Center of Excellence in Hepatitis and Liver Cancer,
Department of Biochemistry, Faculty of Medicine,
Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, 10330 Thailand
Point-by-Point Response to the Editor and Reviewers’ Comments

Technical Comments:

Editor Comments:

1. Please address Reviewer 2’s comments. Raw p-values should always be presented in tables, with adjusted p values (adjustment for sex, age). P values corrected for multiple testing in table notes or discussion.

Ans. Thank you very much for the recommendation. We have revised the MS as the editor/reviewer’s suggestion by adding these data in Methods (see page 6, first paragraph) and in table notes (see Table 2, 3, and Supplement Table 1).

2. It appears that references 19, 23 should also be in page 4, L14, together with ref 8-13.

Ans. We have added these references together with ref 8-13 (page 4, first paragraph). Thus, the ref #19 and #23 has been changed to be ref #14 and #15, respectively. In addition, the following references (after ref#15) have been modified accordingly.

Reviewer reports:

Nghiem Xuan Hoan (Reviewer 1): Please include all comments for the authors in this box rather than uploading your report as an attachment. Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included in a text format.

Please overwrite this text when adding your comments to the authors.

Ans. Thank you very much for the useful advice.

Miguel A. Garcia-Perez (Reviewer 2): The manuscript has improved considerably after the review as the authors have amended all the suggestions made for the reviewers and the editor. With this revision the manuscript gains clarity and rigor.
However, this reviewer would need the authors to clarify how they applied the bonferroni correction for multiplicity of tests. The most immediate way to do this is to divide the alpha value (usually 0.05) by the number of tests performed. If 2 SNPs are analysed, then 0.05 / 2 = 0.025. Several results that appear in this new version do not exceed this value so they would not pass the correction and consequently would not be statistically significant. Please explain and correct conveniently.

Ans. We appreciate the comments and would like to apologize for some mistakes in the previous revised MS. In the current revised version, we have applied the Bonferroni method for correcting multiple comparisons as the reviewer’s suggestion (see in Methods, page 6, first paragraph).