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Reviewer's report:

The authors have stated that they have "double checked the original sequencing data" and have determined that they "did not detect TCONS_0029745". The authors have not clarified how this conclusion was reached, so I am still confused how they reached this statement. Perhaps they visualised the sequencing reads in BAM files through IGV or they interrogated the gene count matrix files. To reiterate I am only questioning if CTA-384D8.35 is actually a longer transcript which may have important implications. However I also realise that my suggestion to visualise sequencing data may not work as it is possible the sequencing depth is not high enough to resolve this.

Even without this information the observations made in the manuscript are still novel and worthy of reporting. The authors have also now provided a possibility for other researchers to gain access (via email listed in methods) to sequencing data in case other researchers want to explore this.

While the authors have not fully addressed my concerns I am not sure if it is worth holding manuscript back for another round of review before publication. It is clear that there is an interesting network identified in this study. It would have been nice to provide some supporting evidence characterizing the short transcript CTA-384D8.35.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
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