

We thank the reviewer for their comments and suggestions.

Reviewer 1:

Common polymorphisms of PTPN2 gene are not associated with an increased risk of Crohn's disease in an Asian country. General comments: The authors described the two common polymorphisms in PTPN2 gene and their association with risk of Crohn's disease in an Asian country (India). This is an interesting investigation but the results did not show the association these polymorphism with an increased risk of developing Crohn's disease which is present in Western country.

Comment: The title accurately reflects the major topic and contents of the study. Abstract gives a clear delineation of the research objective and the results. The manuscript is well designed and had appropriate methodology. The text is easy to follow and is accompanied by appropriate tables and figures. The data is clearly presented in result section.

Response: We thank the reviewer for the positive remarks.

Comment: Some of the results are repeated in the manuscript body and figures.

Response: We have remove information on age of onset, perianal disease , disease location and disease behaviour from the text (Results, first paragraph) as the information is presented in Table 1.

Comment: The authors critically discussed the obtained results. In the literature review, recent researches are listed to this topic. In conclusion, this is a very interesting manuscript which provides an insight in the complexity of the Crohn's disease etiology on the genetic level. On the other side, the study repeat the topic of other studies of PTPN2 polymorphism in Asian countries which gives low impact to this investigation.

Response: As there are differences even among Asian countries with regards to prevalence of IBD, we felt the need for this study in a region where this polymorphism has not been previously evaluated.

Reviewer 2:

The article “Common polymorphisms of PTPN2 gene are not associated with increased risk of Crohn’s disease in an Asian country” is very interesting. I make some considerations with the intention of improving the manuscript:

Comment: Was it considered matched, case- control, for gender? 46 vs. 37

Response: There was no significant difference in the gender distribution ($p=0.41$) between the cases and controls. As the number of cases were slightly more than cases, perfect matching was difficult. We have modified the ‘methodology’ section accordingly.

Comment: What are the main limitations of the study?

Response: We have included the limitations in the ‘discussion section’ (6th paragraph).

Comment: The number of patients analysed in the case and control groups for each type of gene should be included in Table 2.

Response: We have added this in table 2

Comment: Check minor language errors.

Response: We have checked and corrected errors.

Comment: Correct important errors in references.

Response: References have been rechecked and formatted according to journal requirements.

Science editor:

Response: References have been rechecked and formatted according to journal requirements.

Company Editor in chief: I recommend the manuscript to be published in the World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pathophysiology.

Response: We thank you for the opportunity.