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Author's response to reviews: see over
From the Editors

1. In the introduction it is stated that "the level of systemic inflammation, measured by high-sensitivity C-reactive protein (CRP), may be a predictor of cardiovascular disease and worse prognosis". Hence, you have to explain why a non-hs CRP method has been used in your population. Has non-hs CRP been associated with increased CVD risk or has CRP, measured by the particle-enhanced immunoturbidimetric method been previously used as a marker or predictor for cardiovascular end-points? All these issues should be addressed in the discussion.

Both the articles referred to in the introduction regarding CRP and CVD risk have the same sensitivity ranges in CRP measurement as ours, one being a hs-CRP method and one being a CRP method. In the literature otherwise CRP and hs-CRP are used interchangeably, the important parameter is the sensitivity of the CRP measurement. So, even though we do not use a hs-CRP method, the sensitivity if 0.3 mg/L, and is comparable to the sensitivity range the FDA mentions for hs-CRP measurement.

We have thus updated the article with these issues, removing the mentioning of high-sensitivity in the introduction. We also have added a sentence in the discussion: line 250-252: The assay, albeit not being a hs-CRP measurement, conveys the same sensitivity as an hs-CR measurement.

2. Please change the key-words accordingly
The key-words have been changed

3. In the "Methods", specify clearly that this is NOT hs-CRP.
We have specifically stated that this is a non hs-CRP method in the Methods section:
Line 112: within the limits of 0,3 - 350 mg/l; this is not a high-sensitivity CRP measurement.

We hope that we have sufficiently addressed all identified issues, and we look forward to and hope for a positive reply. Please, do not hesitate to contact us if there are any further questions.
On behalf of all authors,

Yours,

Elisabeth Svensson, PhD
Department of Clinical Epidemiology; Institute of Clinical Medicine
Aarhus University