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MS: 1150916093152327 ¿ Gender, socio-economic status and metabolic syndrome in middle-aged and old adults

Ana-Cristina Santos, Shah Ebrahim, Henrique Barros

Amendments according to referees reports

`¿2 ¿ This is not a good reason not to use the most up-to-date version. There is a good reason the definition was changed, and that is because it is better than the previous version, and therefore the intention is to use this, rather than the old version. Imagine if all authors used this rationale - the new (and better) definition would never get used! I think the authors should at the very least report prevalence based on the new version of this definition.

As suggested by the referee, we have included in the result section a paragraph reporting the overall and by sex prevalence of metabolic syndrome considering the ATP III and the IDF definition.

`¿7) From reference 16, it appears that this survey was set up as a case control study of MI. The full details surrounding the study design and sampling need to be presented. Was the entire city of Porto the sample frame?¿

This comment has not been addressed.

EPIPorto cohort study is a health and nutrition survey using a representative sample of the adult population of Porto, Portugal. Random digit dialling was used to select households followed by simple random sampling to select one subjects aged 18 years within each household. Refusals were not substituted. The sample frame included the entire city of Porto and a proportion of participation of 70% was archived. The EPIPorto cohort participants have also been used as controls for several case-control studies, including that mentioned on risk factors for myocardial infarction.

`¿8- Mention of these facts (why income and geographic SES measures were
not included) should be included in the methods section

Following the referee suggestion, we have included in the methods section the reasons why income and geographic distribution SES were not included in the final data analysis.

`¿9- Please check again that these figures are correct (by reanalysing the data) ¿ the alteration made to the table was not what was expected. Are the authors 100% sure that these figures are correct?

We have reanalysed the data and the figures regarding the logistic regression models are correct.