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Dear editor,

Thank you very much for your constructive and positive comments. We have modified the manuscript as suggested and responded to the comments as listed below. We hope that the revised manuscript is acceptable for publication.

Thank you.

With best wishes,

Yours sincerely

Yaping Tian

Department of Clinical Biochemistry,

Chinese PLA General Hospital.

No. 28 Fu-xing Road, Beijing 100853, China.

Tel: +86 10 66939374

Fax: +86 10 88217385

Email: tianyp61@gmail.com
Replies to the editorial comments:

I note that in your regression model, and you explain this very well to Reviewer 1, you entered LDL/HDL ratio and also LDL as both together provided better predictive power than LDL/HDL alone. It is a bit unusual to enter the same variable (LDL) twice in a model - in your case it is part of the ratio and then again on its own. Would you achieve similar predictive value if you entered "LDL" and "HDL" (i.e. no ratio)? This may provide the cleanest data for this model but you can then still argue that for practical purposes (e.g. in the clinic) the LDL/HDL ratio is a convenient way of integrating the information from both parameters.

RE: It is really true as you mentioned that it is a bit unusual to enter the same variable twice in a regression model. Since the LDL/HDL ratio and HDL were finally included by multiple stepwise regression, this time we established a new regression model including specific variables (i.e. age, LDL and HDL) according to your suggestion. Data of ROC analysis indicated that the new regression model showed the similar area under the curve to previous model (0.788, 95%CI; 0.740–0.837, p<0.001 vs. 0.770, 95%CI; 0.718–0.821, p<0.001). Therefore, we replaced the regression model with the new model and modified the article in related sections, including results, discussion, conclusions and figure.