

Editor's Comments:

According to the assessment of reviewer (Sha). NMR evidence, PCR, DNA repair and synthesis all favors formation of the DNA double helix. The author's arguments against formation of dsDNA are not particularly strong.

Author's Feedback:

This seems irrational, as the referee agreed in the previous review that NMR does not clarify the issue in the case of large (natural) DNA! The above assessment is overarching and contains too many sweeping generalizations. The point being made in the paper is that the evidence is not strong either way! This needs to be accepted for discussion and debate, and hopefully would guide future research in this area.

All this is indicated by the fact that the referee himself asked for repeated revisions!

These points have been brought out in all the revisions of the paper (as per referees' suggestions). I wonder what further revision is possible! The referees have so far provided most useful inputs that have certainly improved the paper, but beyond this, personal issues should not cloud our judgment about an important scientific problem – for the sake of science itself and also of the journal.

I do appreciate the interest given to this submission so far, noting the controversial nature of the topic – hence suitable as an opinion article. I would point out that the article needs to be judged on its own merit and not on what we believe would be the initial reaction of the community. Scientific forums and journals have a particularly important role to play in cases such as this, a responsibility that should be accepted and discharged by all parties concerned. Thank you for your understanding and patience!