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Author's response to reviews:

Oct 9th, 2014

Dear Dr. József Kónya,

Thank you for your decision letter dated Oct 8th, 2014, regarding our manuscript (No.1709571409136703), entitled “URG4 overexpression correlates with cervical cancer progression and poor prognosis in patients with early-stage cervical cancer”, authored by Lan Zhang, He Huang, Longjuan Zhang, Teng Hou, Shu Wu, Qidan Huang, Libing Song and Jihong Liu. We have added necessary content and made appropriated modification in Table 4 according to the associate editor suggested. All amendments are highlighted in red in the revised manuscript. In addition, point-by-point responses to the comments are listed below in this letter. We hope that you will find that the current version of our manuscript is suitable for publication in BMC cancer.

If you have any question regarding the re-submitted manuscript, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely yours,

Lan Zhang, Ph.D. Candidate
Point-to-point response to Associate Editor

1. Title has to indicate the endpoint i.e. prognostic markers for what? (OS? DFS? else?)

Response:

Thanks for the editor’s comment. The endpoint of prognostic markers is OS. We have added it in the title of Table 4.

2. For each RR calculation, the reference group has to be indicated clearly.

Response:

We appreciate editor’s insightful suggestion and marked the reference group as “Ref” in Table 4.

3. The parameters to which the multivariate analysis was adjusted has to be indicated.

(preferrably in footnote)

Response:

Thanks for the editor’s comment. We are sorry that the parameters to which the multivariate analysis was not written in the submitted manuscript. The parameters were added in footnote of Table 4.

4. RR=0.282 is in disagreement with row 317 stating “deep stromal invasion is prognostic factor for poor OS”.

Response:

We apologize for the unfortunate mistake. The reference group is deep stromal invasion group. It means that no deep stromal invasion is a protective factor. The correction has been made in Table 4.

5. Present footnote “*p<0.05” has no sense.

Response:

The reviewer’s point is well taken. We have deleted the footnote “*p<0.05” of Table 4.

In order for the changes to be recognized more easily, we have marked the corrections of Table 4 in red in revised manuscript.