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Reviewer's report:

Dear Authors and Editorial Team,

In general the authors have made satisfactory attempts in addressing key concerns for the manuscript and the manuscript has improved.

My concerns is now regarding the text and English as the author do state that a native English speaker has reviewed it but improvements still need to be made.

1) Conclusions should be toned down as a non-randomized study of 100 patients which is susceptible to bias related to observational study is unlikely definitively conclude that genotype influences treatment.

2) Revise first sentence as nephrotic syndrome is not commonly seen in every clinic - Nephrotic syndrome (NS) is a common condition in renal medicine which has high morbidity in middle aged and elderly people.

3) Second sentence: The response to treatment (NOT treatment effect) varies greatly,…

4) In the introduction: "The majority of the studies focused on the impact of gene polymorphisms in renal transplant recipients." This sentence needs some lead into the sentence or explanation. The existing literature investigating these gene polymorphisms have been mainly derived from cohorts of renal transplant patients.

5) Under ethical consideration should state be completely revised. We received approval from the Medical Ethics Committee of the 88th Hospital of PLA (What is PLA?) for undertaking this study. The study was designed to be secure and fair to patients while minimizing risk of harm to participants. The included participants provided written informed voluntary consent.
and participants under the age of 18 years had written consent obtained from their parents. Participants had the right to withdraw from the study at any time.

6) Discussion first sentence needs to be toned down. We found evidence that X are factors which may influence the clinical therapeutic effects of TAC on NS patients…

7) Do not use contractions have not NOT haven't

8) The first paragraph of discussion does not explain why it is important? Should we test patients genotype routinely prior to treatment to tailor treatment?

9) Regarding "Previous studies have focused on the effects of gene polymorphisms of CYP3 A4 and CYP3 A5 and ABCB1 genes on TAC metabolism in other setting and there are few studies on NS." What are the few studies?

10) Regarding "Some studies think that ABCB1 polymorphisms have nothing to do with the clinical efficacy of TAC." Studies do not THINK!

11) In the discussion: "First, the study population is different, and the formula given by the National Health and Family Planning Commission is suitable for kidney transplant patients, but the objects of this study are NS patients." Does not make sense and needs to be explained.

12) In the discussion explain what you mean: "Second, It may be that the sample size is smaller."

13) In the conclusion do not use "to sum up" use In summary.

14) In the conclusions have to be soften as this is an underpowered non-randomized study to provide strong evidence.

15) Last sentence needs to be improved. Therefore, our study provides evidence that there may be a potential role for gene detection in tailoring therapy for patients with NS in order to improve response to treatment.
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