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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Mr. Pirooznia,

Please find attached the revised version of the original article (MGNM-D-18-00322), entitled: “Epigenetic and expression changes of CEP55, FOXD3, FOXF2, GNAO1, GRIA4, and KCNA5 genes in colorectal cancer”, which we have submitted for publication in the BMC Medical Genomics.

I would like to inform you that there is a slight change in affiliation for manuscript coauthor Daša Jevšinek Skok. She has recently moved to another organization, therefore we provided both affiliations, the Institute of Pathology, where the work was performed, and her current position at Agricultural Institute.

We appreciate the positive feedback and opportunity to make the revision of our manuscript. With the help of the reviewers and their suggestions and questions, we improved and supplemented the manuscript. We hope that we have addressed all the issues raised by the reviewers correctly and sufficiently. All changes in the revised manuscript are described below.

We would also like to take this opportunity to thank you and reviewers for valuable comments and suggestions. We look forward to hearing from you regarding our submission. We would be glad to respond to any further questions and comments that you may have.
We appreciate all the comments, questions and issues raised by the reviewers. As a consequence, the manuscript has changed and all the changes can be viewed as track changes in manuscript file. We are presenting our answers to reviewers’ comments below.

We noticed there are letters a-d missing in Figure 3. We added the letters and uploaded the Figure 3 again.

Vincent Avecilla, PhD, MPH (Reviewer 1)
Reviewer: Study shows strong study design, however the explanation needs a little bit of reviewing and clarification, particularly sections "Aberrantly methylated probes and differentially expressed genes" and "experimental validation." Furthermore, please review study for grammar and correct verbiage usage [ex. an vs. a; then vs than; correct usage of (,) & (;)].
Response: We would like to thank the reviewer for his valuable comment. We have reviewed the manuscript in order to improve the clarity of the manuscript. The manuscript also underwent changes made by a native speaking lector. We hope that the revised manuscript has improved in clarity of the study.

Seong Soo A An, Reviewer 2
Reviewer: Authors used 2 pipelines, MuTect from the Broad Institute for the reliable and accurate identification of somatic point mutations in next generation sequencing data of cancer genomes. But, I could not find any information on V2 pipeline.
Response: We would like to thank the reviewer for his valuable comments. We have included more information about RNAseq V2 pipeline (page 21, lines 398-403).

Reviewer: However, the English was poor with wrong verb tenses, punctuations, and run-on sentences with poor transitions between paragraphs. This manuscript needs extensive grammar corrections.
Response: We revised the manuscript and also made changes suggested by a native speaking lector. We hope that revised manuscript has improved grammar and transitions between paragraphs.