**Author’s response to reviews**

**Title:** Association of the MMP-9 polymorphism and ischemic stroke risk in southern Chinese Han population

**Authors:**

Ning Gao (gaoningtt@126.com)

Tie Guo (58708300@qq.com)

Han Luo (15999441@qq.com)

Guolong Tu (631139231@qq.com)

Fanglin Niu (985957323@qq.com)

Mengdan Yan (278602501@qq.com)

ying Xia (xiaying622@163.com)

**Version:** 3  **Date:** 21 Feb 2019

**Author’s response to reviews:**

Dear editors:

Thank you for letter and for the editor’s comments concerning our manuscript entitled “Association of the MMP-9 polymorphism and ischemic stroke risk in southern Chinese Han population” (ID: NURL-D-18-00613R3). Those comments are all valuable and helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our researcher. We have studied comments carefully and have made correction which we hope meet with approval. The main corrections in the paper and the responds to the editor’s comments are as flowing:

Responds to the editor’s comments:

1. Please include in the title page the email addresses of all authors.

Response: Thanks for the editor’s kind suggestion. On the title page of the revised manuscript, line 13, page 1 indicate the email addresses of all authors.

2. Please change the title of your ‘Materials and Methods’ section to ‘Methods’.
Response: Thanks for the editor’s good evaluation. In the revised manuscript, the title of "materials and Methods" was changed to "Methods" (Methods section, line 106, page 6).

3. Please include a 'Declarations' heading above your Declarations.

Response: Thanks for the editor’s good evaluation. "Declarations" (Declarations section, line 221, page 12) have been added to the top of the Declarations in the revised manuscript.

4. Please represent authors’ names using their full initials, not their full/surname, in the Authors’ Contributions section. If there are any duplicated initials, please differentiate them to make it clear that the initials refer to separate authors.

Response: Thanks for the editor’s good evaluation. The part of the author's contribution to the revised manuscript has been replaced with the author's full initials (Declarations section, line 239, page 13).

5. Please include a statement in the Authors’ contributions section to the effect that all authors have read and approved the manuscript, and ensure that this is the case.

Response: Thanks for the editor’s kind advice. The author's contribution to the revised manuscript has been accompanied by a statement that all authors have read and approved the manuscript and that this is true (Declarations section, line 241, page 13). All authors contributed significantly to the final draft of the paper and agreed to submit the manuscript for publication.

6. Please remove the response to reviewer’s document from the end of your manuscript file as this is no longer needed in the publication process.

Response: Thanks for the editor’s good evaluation and kind suggestion. The response to the reviewer document has been deleted at the end of the manuscript file.

7. At this stage, please upload your manuscript as a single, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colors. All relevant tables/figures/additional files should also be clean versions. Figures (and additional files) should remain uploaded as separate files.

Response: Thanks for the editor’s good evaluation and kind suggestion. A clean version is now uploaded.

Thanks again for your valuable advice. If there are any questions, we will be glad to make modifications in time.

Thank you and best regards.
Yours sincerely,

Corresponding author:

Name: Ying Xia

E-mail: xiaying622@163.com