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To the BMC ID Editors and Reviewers:

We thank you for the close review and helpful feedback of our manuscript, “The efficacy and safety of insulin-sensitizing drugs in HIV-associated lipodystrophy syndrome: a meta-analysis of randomized trials”. As requested by the Editors, we have enclosed a second revised manuscript with tracked changes. Additionally, all figures and tables have been updated and are also attached. We have provided a point-by-point response to the reviewer comments. With the incorporation of the reviewer revisions, we feel that our manuscript is substantially improved and our findings will remain of high interest to your readership.

Below you will find our replies to the reviewer’ reports and the editorial requests.

REPORTS:

Reviewer 1: Dr. Shelley Salpeter
Comments for the author:

1. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?

(a) Inclusion criteria allowed for comparison with placebo or no treatment, but this was not consistently reported.

_Thank you for bringing this to our attention. We have indicated “placebo or no treatment” in all applicable places in the manuscript, tables, figure and appendices._

(b) The revised manuscript has taken out most of the reports of nonsignificant result, but not all.

_We have reviewed the manuscript and either clarified or removed all statements regarding nonsignificant results found both in the Methods and Discussion sections._

(c) In the section on rosiglitazone compared with metformin, it states that there were “significant” reductions in HDL, and “clinically relevant” reductions in LDL and TG.

_Thank you for pointing out this area of potential confusion. The “clinically relevant” changes were not statistically significant so to be consistent with the above recommendation we entirely removed the statement indicating clinically relevant reductions in LDL and TG on page 13 of the manuscript._
(d) Clarify what the statement that 5 summary test did not pass their respective tests for heterogeneity means.

*We did mean that these five tests indicated evidence for potential heterogeneity and have added a clarifying phrase on page 14 of the manuscript.*

2. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?

(a) Please add a reference to the statement that recent data have raised safety concerns about the use of thiazolidinediones in non-HIV populations.

*We have included a reference from Nissen et al, per suggested by the reviewer. Thank you.*

(b) In the discussion, the statement that “head-to-head trials reinforced findings of placebo-controlled trials” could be clarified.

*We have elucidated the meaning of this statement on page 15 of the manuscript, as suggested by the reviewer.*

(c) In the discussion, please provide references for the statement that these findings are consistent with a growing safety concerns surrounding the use of thiazolidinediones and the risk of cardiovascular evidence.

*We once again referenced the review study by Nissen et al.*

BMC ID Editors:
Comments for the Editors:

We have carefully reviewed our manuscript to ensure that it conforms to the journal style.

******************************************************************************

Thank you again for reviewing our manuscript and providing helpful feedback. Please feel free to contact us with any additional questions.

Sincerely,

Siddharth Sheth, MPH
Robin Larson, MD MPH