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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Dr Boelaert,

Thank you for your letter in response to our submitted manuscript.

Editor Comments:
The authors have submitted a substantially revised paper which will be acceptable for publication once some minor revision has been undertaken.

Response:
Thank you for your careful review and support. We fully agree with the comments from Reviewer 2, and have completely adopted both minor revisions requested (see below).

Reviewer reports:
Martin Read (Reviewer 2): The authors have now addressed the majority of my concerns. I have a couple of minor revisions for new Figure 2B that the authors need to address. They are:

(i) In Table 2 the p-value given for serum proNGF (continuous) between hyperthyroid versus euthyroid hormone status is 0.002. However, the p-value provided in new Figure 2B is 0.02. Please can the authors clarify whether this is correct.

(ii) In Figure 2B the numerical range of the y-axis is from 0.25 to 32. It would be more appropriate if the y-axis ranged from 0 to 32 as the median value for serum proNGF measurements is zero.

Response:
We thank Dr Read for his careful review.
(i) We acknowledge the inclusion of this typographical error and we thank Dr Read for bringing this to our attention. The correct value of 0.002 is reported in Table 2. The Figure has been amended to include the correct value.
(ii) We have changed the numerical value of the Y-axis to begin at 0 as suggested.