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Author’s response to reviews: see over
Dear editor,

Thank you for giving us a chance to revise the manuscript, we also thank the reviewers for their good suggestions on our manuscript. We have revised the manuscript according to the comments of the two reviewers. The point to point responses are listed below. We have highlighted the changes in our manuscript.

**Reviewer #1**

**Minor essential revisions**

**Under Background**

1. 2nd paragraph, line 8: SFRP genes- SFRP should not be in italics

   **Response:** Thank you for your advice. We have made corresponding changes according to your comment. Thank you.

2. 3rd paragraph, line 5: was contributes- should be changed to “was found to contribute”

   **Response:** Thank you for your suggestion. We have changed “was contributes” to “was found to contribute” in our revised manuscript.

**Results**

3. 4th paragraph, line 3: is graphic- should be changed to “is a graphic”

   **Response:** Thank you for your reminding. We have changed “is graphic” to “is a graphic” in our manuscript. Thanks a lot.

4. 4th paragraph, line 4: and specificity and- should be changed to “and specificity, and”

   **Response:** Thank you for your comments. We have made changes according to
your advice. Thank you.

5. 4th paragraph, line 7: The large area- should be changed to “The larger the area”

Response: Thank you for raising this to us. We have made corresponding changes in our revised manuscript.

Discussion

6. Last paragraph, line 16: except SFRP1 was- should be changed to “except SFRP1, which was

Response: Thank you for your advice. We have changed it in our revised manuscript.

7. Last paragraph, line 17: result showed- should be changed to “results showed”

Response: Thank you for your suggestion. We have changed it in our revised manuscript.

List of Abbreviations

8. This should include AUC, area under the curve

Response: Thank you for your reminding. We have added “AUC, area under the curve” in our revised manuscript.

In a word, we found the reviewer’s comments are quite helpful, and we have revised our paper point-by-point according to the good suggestions. Additionally, we have revised our manuscript by Edanz (www.edanzediting.com/bmc) to improve the style of written English of our manuscript previously. Thank you the review again for his good advice.
Reviewer #2

Minor Essential Revision:

1. - line 48: please remove "was"

Response: Thank you for your reminding. We have changed this sentence according to the suggestions of you two reviewers. Thank you.

2. - line 124: please change to "ROC curve is a graphic presentation"

Response: Thank you for your advice. We have changed it in our revised manuscript.

3. - line 128: please change to "the largest the area, the more accurate the test is"

Response: Thank you for your good suggestion. We have made changes according to your advice. Thank you.

We acknowledge the two reviewers’ comments very much, which are valuable in improving the quality of our manuscript.

Thank the reviewers’ comments on our manuscript again. We hope that the revised manuscript has addressed all the criticisms raised by the reviewers and that the manuscript is now suitable for publication in your journal. Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

Xiongming Pu

E-mail: xiongmpu@163.com