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Author’s response to reviews:

Responses to the reviewers

Dear Editor:

On behalf of my co-authors, we thank you very much for giving us an opportunity to revise our manuscript. We greatly appreciate the editor and the reviewers for their positive and constructive comments and suggestions on our manuscript entitled “A 15q25.2 microdeletion phenotype for premature ovarian failure in a Chinese girl: a case report and review of literature” (manuscript MGNM-D-19-00475). To address the critiques of the reviewers, our manuscript was revised and improved according to your comments, and used the English language editing service to improve the English language. Please find attached the revised version (with changes marked in red), which we would like to submit for your consideration.

I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,

Corresponding author: Chunlin Wang
Please find below point-by-point responses to the reviewers’ comments:

First, we thank the reviewers for their positive and constructive comments and suggestions.

For Reviewer 1

Comment 1:
Please provide more clinical details for the patients, such as sonography of breasts, uterus and ovary of the patient. Written description of clinical features is inadequate. What is the latest clinical management of the patient?
Answer:
Thank you for your thorough review and suggestion to improvise our manuscript. The description regarding the patient breast development has been improved (Case presentation section, lines 5-7, page 3). The sonography of uterus and ovary of the patient were described in Case presentation section, lines 7-10, page 3.
Patients with POF generally use estrogen replacement therapy. However, the patient has not received further treatment because of her parents' concern of the side effects. We have added this information in the Case presentation section, lines 27-28, page 3 and line 1, page 4.

Comment 2:
Please provide parental array data/image as evidence of de novo deletion. Is the deletion heterozygous or homozygous? What is the array platform used?
Answer:
Thank you for your valuable comment. The aberration was neither detected in her father nor her mother, indicating that the deletion was arisen de novo (described in Case presentation section, lines 19-20, page 3). Also the parents were healthy and nonconsanguineous, and so we inferred that the patient's genetic changes were de novo.
The results of DNA microarray analysis showed that the deletion was heterozygous (Figure 1), and we have added the heterozygous information in the revised manuscript (Case presentation section, lines 16-18, page 3).
The CytoOneArray chip from Phalanx Biotech company was used for DNA microarray analysis, and we have provided the corresponding information in the revised manuscript (Case presentation section, lines 16-17, page 3).

Comment 3:
Include OMIM ID after genes/disease for easier reference, e.g. BNC1 (OMIM 601930)
Answer:
Thank you for your thorough review of our manuscript. The changes were made in the revised manuscript accordingly.

Comment 4:
Please be consistent in in-text reference quoting (e.g. Wittgenstein et al instead of Wittgenstein, page 7 line 8) and check for grammatical mistakes/typo
Answer:
We thank you for suggesting this point, and we agree with your viewpoint. The corrections in the revised manuscript were made as per your suggestion.
For Reviewer 2
Thank you for your thorough review of our manuscript, and many thanks for your positive and constructing comments. It is a great honor for me to receive your recommendation.