

Dear Dr. Rusk,

Thank you for sending the reviewer report for our paper titled "Analysis of Sensitive Information Leakage in Functional Genomics Signal Profiles through Genomic Deletions". We greatly appreciate your reviewing our manuscript. We were, however, disappointed by the decision. We are wondering if it is at all possible for you to reconsider the manuscript and perhaps let us submit a rebuttal. Our reason for asking for a reconsideration is that we think the referee reports do not reveal any major weakness in our manuscript. We believe that much of the referees' concerns are caused by unclear explanation of methods and results. We believe these can be addressed by clarification and reorganization of the main text. In addition, we think that privacy is a very important topic and our paper would be a perfect complement to the ENCODE rollout as it deals with the privacy of functional genomics data.

We understand that ^{REFEREES} you have two main concerns. First is about the reviewers' doubts on RNA-seq data revealing underlying genomic deletions. We can clarify this by giving solid examples about how RNA-seq signal profiles do reveal genomic deletions. In addition, we do agree with the fact that RNA-seq is a much more prevalent in clinical setting than ChIP-Seq. This claim already supports our manuscript: This is exactly why our anonymization strategy focuses on protecting RNA-seq signal profiles. Second is about the fact that although Reviewer 2 finds the attacks convincing, Reviewer raised concerns about anonymization procedure. We think this is a miscommunication that can be easily solved by clarification: We do not claim that we are anonymizing all the sensitive information leakage using the proposed signal smoothing procedure. We basically show

LGM P

that there is a very obvious source of leakage that needs to be immediately patched. As we show, the proposed anonymization procedure is effective in closing this source. We do realize that there can be other sources of information leakage that the Reviewer 2 rightfully mentions. We can highlight and discuss this point in the Discussion section of the manuscript.

Finally, given the timeframe and concerns in the reviews, we think that the referee's questions would not warrant rejection of our manuscript. It would be great if it is possible to have a phone call to go over these. We will be looking forward to hearing from you.

Yours Sincerely,

Mark Gerstein.