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Author's response to reviews: see over
1. Your study has one hypothesis. How did you test it and what’s the result?

   *The way that the hypothesis was tested is included in the sentence detailing the hypothesis (page 5). The results indicate that the hypothesis is positive for some risk factors but not for all. This is explained in the first paragraph of the discussion.*

2. What is the title of your larger study? Page 5 mentions that data used for this analysis were obtained from a national survey. If it’s the same title of your paper, should you change the title of your paper, since you use only some data of the larger study?

   *The name of the larger study is included in the first line of the methods section. For extra clarification it has been repeated later in that paragraph.*

3. On page 9, it is still not clear about your explanation on Hosmer and Lemeshaw’s recommendation that all variables with a p-value <0.25 at the univariate level were included in the initial multivariate model. I still don’t understand that what kind of statistical test that you used for the univariate analysis and what is the specific name of Hosmer and Lemeshaw’s test.

   *There is no Hosmer and Lemeshaw statistical test per se. Their multivariable procedure is referenced. P values only were assessed. If p<0.25 the variables were included in the multivariable modelling (in line with what Hosmer and Lemeshaw recommend). We believe this is fully explained in the text. A reordering of one sentence was undertaken so that the procedure is clearer.*

4. In the Results Section, tables 1 and 2 should have more description in text. It seems like you expect that the readers have to try to read the tables by themselves. In my opinion, you should inform the readers what the highlights of these 2 tables are.

   *It is expected that the reader could understand the tables. They are univariate tables and in the opinion of the authors, self-explanatory.*

5. The title of table 1 should be socio-economic and demographic characteristics because what included are not only demographic characteristics.

   *The title has been changed as suggested.*

6. In the Discussion Section, there is very little discussion there. Several paragraphs are just the results without discussion. More than one page
in this section is about strengths and weaknesses of the study which should not be included in this section.

The authors believe that addressing the strengths and weaknesses of the study is a very important and necessary component of any discussion section of a manuscript. This has been highlighted in a recent BioMed Central publication –


We also believe the discussion, while incorporating some of the results of the study, has incorporated relevant other studies and discussed the implications of these results/comparisons.

7. Please check reference number 14. There is no title of the article there.

Amendment made.

8. Table 5 is 3 pages long. Each page should have the table title with the word “continued” at the end.

Amendments made.