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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor:

Thank you for your letter 11 Apr 2017 regarding our manuscript entitled “ARLTS1 polymorphism is associated with risk of familial cancer: evidence from a meta-analysis” (HCCP-D-16-00036R1).

Sorry for replying your letter so late. We carefully considered the reviewer’s comments and suggestions and amended the manuscript accordingly. In addition, we have put serious efforts into revising the manuscript and made numerous editorial changes, including re-wording some sentences and correcting various spelling and grammar errors. We hope that the revised version is suitable for publication in your journal.

Thanks again for your reconsideration.

Point-by-point replies to the reviewers’ comments are listed below.

With kind regards,

Hui-yi Lv
Point-by-point responses to the reviewer’s comments

We thank the reviewers for their positive and constructive comments. We amended the manuscript to accommodate the comments and revised the manuscript extensively. We hope that the revised version is now acceptable for publication.

Reviewer #3:

The article entitled "ARLTS1 polymorphism is associated with risk of familial cancer: evidence from a meta-analysis" by Jiang and colleagues is a meta-analysis for association of 5 different ARLTS1 variants with cancer risk. The manuscript needs substantial grammatical corrections; overall this article would be of interest to the readership of the Hereditary Cancers in Clinical Practice. However, following comments need to be addressed:

1. The symbol of the gene "ARLTS1" should be italicized as "ARLTS1" throughout the manuscript.
2. "Por131Leu" should be corrected to "Pro131Leu" throughout the manuscript.
3. Introduction, paragraph 1 and line 3: please provide the full name of "ARF" as it appeared first, followed by the abbreviation.
4. Introduction, paragraph 2, and line 2-3: There is no need to write the name of journal in the text, as the corresponding reference will appear in the bibliography.
5. Introduction, 2nd last line: "more precise estimation the relationship between…." please correct as "more precise estimation of the relationship between…."
6. Table 1: Columns headings "Variants" and "SNP" should be changed to "Nucleotide variants" and "Amino acid change" respectively. Nucleotide variants should be written in standard HGVS nomenclature i.e T442C should be written as c.442T>C and other nucleotide variants should also be written like this.
7. Materials and Methods, Data Extraction and Quality Assessment sections: There is no need to mention the names of the authors here for their contribution, just remove the names written in brackets. It should be mentioned in "Authors Contribution" section.

8. Numbering of the tables should be corrected in the text e.g. quality assessment scale Tab 1 is actually a Table 2 etc.

9. Results section, paragraph 1, line 5: "one studies contained" should be corrected to "one study contained". The authors should carefully audit the manuscript for such type of grammatical mistakes.

10. The authors should adopt uniformity for mentioning the genotypes e.g. CC vs. TT, "vs." is written in capital as "VS." in some places. It should be uniform as "vs." throughout the text and the tables.

11. Discussion section is poorly written e.g., paragraph 1, line 4: "The our suppositional mechanism..." Please correct this sentence.

12. Discussion section, paragraph 2, line 3: "studies with which information was available" please correct as "the informative studies".

13. Abstract: The conclusion needs to be realistic and based on the provided data. There is little evidence to recommend this gene (only one SNP or the whole gene??) as an important target for personalized medicine in cancer treatment. The study is about associated cancer risks. It is confusing that how authors have recommended it in cancer treatment and cancer type(s)???

We thank the reviewer for these comments which helped us improve the quality of our manuscript. We have rewritten our manuscript according to your suggestion.

1. The symbol of the gene "ARLTS1" should be italicized as "ARLTS1" throughout the manuscript.

We fully agree with your suggestions. ARLTS1 have been italicized as "ARLTS1" throughout the manuscript.

2. "Por131Leu" should be corrected to "Pro131Leu" throughout the manuscript.

We fully agree with your suggestions. Por131Leu have been corrected to Pro131Leu throughout the manuscript.
3. Introduction, paragraph 1 and line 3: please provide the full name of "ARF" as it appeared first, followed by the abbreviation.

We fully agree with your suggestions. We have provided the full name of "ARF". (paragraph 1 and line 3)

4. Introduction, paragraph 2, and line 2-3: There is no need to write the name of journal in the text, as the corresponding reference will appear in the bibliography.

We thank the reviewer for these comments. We have removed the name of journal in the text. (paragraph 2, and line 2-3)

5. Introduction, 2nd last line: "more precise estimation the relationship between…." please correct as "more precise estimation of the relationship between…".

We thank the reviewer for these comments. We have rewritten our manuscript according to your suggestion. (Introduction, 2nd last line)

6. Table 1: Columns headings "Variants" and "SNP" should be changed to "Nucleotide variants" and "Amino acid change" respectively. Nucleotide variants should be written in standard HGVS nomenclature i.e T442C should be written as c.442T>C and other nucleotide variants should also be written like this.

We are grateful for your careful review of our manuscript and have rewritten these sections according to your suggestion.

7. Materials and Methods, Data Extraction and Quality Assessment sections: There is no need to mention the names of the authors here for their contribution, just remove the names written in brackets. It should be mentioned in "Authors Contribution" section.

We thank the reviewer for these comments. We have removed the names written in brackets.

8. Numbering of the tables should be corrected in the text e.g quality assessment scale Tab 1 is actually a Table 2 etc.
We fully agree with your suggestions, which helped us improve the quality of our manuscript. We have corrected the number of the tables.

9. Results section, paragraph 1, line 5: "one studies contained" should be corrected to "one study contained". The authors should carefully audit the manuscript for such type of grammatical mistakes.

We fully agree with your suggestions, we have carefully rewritten the manuscript to correct grammatical mistakes according to your suggestion. (Results section, paragraph 1, line 5)

10. The authors should adopt uniformity for mentioning the genotypes e.g. CC vs. TT, "vs." is written in capital as "VS." in some places. It should be uniform as "vs." throughout the text and the tables.

We fully agree with your suggestion. We have rewritten the manuscript to uniform as "vs." throughout the text and the tables.

11. Discussion section is poorly written e.g., paragraph 1, line 4: "The our suppositional mechanism..." Please correct this sentence.

We are grateful for your careful review of our manuscript and have rewritten these sections according to your suggestion. (paragraph 1, line 4)

12. Discussion section, paragraph 2, line 3: "studies with which information was available" please correct as "the informative studies".

We are grateful for your careful review of our manuscript and have rewritten these sections according to your suggestion. (paragraph 2, line 3)

13. Abstract: The conclusion needs to be realistic and based on the provided data. There is little evidence to recommend this gene (only one SNP or the whole gene??) as an important target for personalized medicine in cancer treatment. The study is about associated cancer risks. It is confusing that how authors have recommended it in cancer treatment and cancer type(s)???
We are grateful for your careful review of our manuscript and have rewritten these sections according to your suggestion. (Abstract: The conclusion)

Reviewer #4: The current paper is improved

If improvements to the English language within your manuscript have been requested, you should have your manuscript reviewed by someone who is fluent in English. If you would like professional help in revising this manuscript, you can use any reputable English language editing service. We can recommend our affiliates Nature Research Editing Service (http://bit.ly/NRES-HS) and American Journal Experts (http://bit.ly/AJE-HS) for help with English usage. Please note that use of an editing service is neither a requirement nor a guarantee of publication. Free assistance is available from our English language tutorial (https://www.springer.com/gb/authors-editors/authorandreviewertutorials/writinginenglish) and our Writing resources (http://www.biomedcentral.com/getpublished/writing-resources). These cover common mistakes that occur when writing in English.

We thank the reviewer for these comments which helped us improve the quality of our manuscript. We have rewritten our manuscript according to your suggestion.