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Author’s response to reviews:

Responses to editor and reviewer’s comments:

Editor Comments:

Editor Comment 1. Please include a statement on consent to participate in the “Ethics approval and consent to participate” section of the Declarations.

Response to comment 1. A statement on consent to participate was included in the section of the Declarations.

Editor Comment 2. Please clarify if consent to publish was obtained by the patient or her next of kin.

Response to comment 2. The written informed consent was provided by the patient.
Editor Comment 3. Please provide figure titles/legends under a separate heading of 'Figure Legends' after the References.

Response to comment 3. Figures was modified as editor’s instructions

Editor Comment 4. In the section 'Funding', please also describe the role of the funding body in the design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript.

Response to comment 4. São Paulo Research Foundation – FAPESP granted this study with financial support.

Editor Comment 5. Please add a section "Additional files".

Response to comment 5. Section "Additional files" was included in the manuscript as recommended.

Editor Comment 6. Please provide further clarifications on the contributions of authors CNSA and NAM.

Response to comment 6. CNSA and NAM are graduate students in our research group and they substantially contributed running the experiments and acquiring data. As graduate students, they participated in most of the different stages of the study.

Editor Comment 7. Please ensure that all figures/tables and supplementary files are cited within the text.

Response to comment 7. All figures/tables and supplementary files were cited within the text.

Editor Comment 8.

Response to comment 8. Manuscript was upload as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes.
Editor Comment 9. Please remove the section "Précis" as it is not part of our submission guidelines.

Response to comment 9. The section "Précis" was removed.

Kylie Louise Gorringe (Reviewer 2):

I appreciate the efforts made by the authors to address my concerns, my remaining points are minor.

We appreciate very much your thoughtful revision of our manuscript and insightful comments for improvements. Thank you.

Reviewer comment 1. Methods: say KRAS exon 15, but primers are for exon 2, please change methods to exon 2.

Response to comment 1. Thank you, we apologize for this mistake. It was changed.

Reviewer comment 2. Methods: typo "1,385 genes"

Response to comment 2. Thank you, it was corrected.

Reviewer comment 3. Results - in the section describing the mutation screening, please give the exact KRAS mutation for both the cDNA and protein change using HGSV nomenclature (http://varnomen.hgvs.org/). This paragraph also needs revising for grammar.

Response to comment 3. HMSV nomenclature for KRAS mutation was included, both for cDNA (NM_004985.4:c.35G>T) and protein (NP_004976.2:p.Gly12Val)

Reviewer comment 4. In Table 2 what do the x3, x1, x29 etc mean? Especially the ones that are x29-30 for example on chr2, chr12. Also "hmz"

Response to comment 4. The x2, x3 etc refer to the number of copies for a given segment, while discrepant numbers, such as x29 are related to mosaicism. Hmz means homozygosis and is associated with cnLOH segments.
Reviewer comment 5. In my earlier review I referred to the black and grey lines to Fig3, when I meant to refer to Fig 5 (the CN profiles). I apologise for this mistake, which no doubt led to some confusion! The supplementary tables now provide information on the cnLOH regions, but perhaps for what is now Figure 5 just add to the legend what the differences between the grey and black dots/lines are - one presumably corresponds to allele differences, while the other is the CN state?

Response to comment 5. You are right, gray dots/lines corresponds to allele differences, while the black is the copy number state. We included this information in the legend.