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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

Thank you very much for your comments. We have been able to address most of the raised points completely, only two points have been partially addressed in the best way we could. Here the details:

1. Overlap: We note that the current submission contains some textual overlap with other previously published works (...) Please re-phrase these sections to minimise overlap.

> Overlap with respect to the first article has been minimized by edits in the methods Section, DNA Polymorphisms. Overlap with the second article has been more challenging, as the analysis is based on the exact same clinical trial. We have done our best nonetheless, please let us know if any specific paragraph needs further rewriting.
2. In the “Ethics approval and consent to participate” section of the Declarations please include the full name of all ethics committees (and the institute to which it belongs to) which approved the study and the committee’s reference number if appropriate.

> Ethics committees for this study involved more than 80 participating centers. The full list would be too long to include in the manuscript. To address this point, we have clarified this point with the sentence: "A full list of all ethics committees, participant centers, and additional details regarding this trial can be retrieved at: https://clinicaltrials.gov"

3. (...) Please can you either move the information in the footnote to the main text or alternatively provide it in an ‘Endnotes’ section.

> We have moved all footnotes to the main text.

4. Funding: please also describe the role of the funding body (...)

> We have rewritten the section and gave detailed information, in particular: "The study was funded by the sponsor (Roche), and designed by the sponsor and investigators. The trial was conducted in accordance with international conference on harmonisation Good Clinical Practice guidelines (...)"

5. Competing Interests: Please remove the information relating to the employment of certain authors from the funding section and include it in the Competing Interests section only.

> Done.

6. 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.

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

> We have removed all tracked changes.