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Author’s response to reviews:

Reply to comments BCAR-D-18-00485R1.

Manuscript titled “Sedentary life style and Framingham risk scores: a population based study in Riyadh city, Saudi Arabia”

We shall like to thank the Editorial office and reviewers for the useful comments. We have made the suggested/ required changes to the manuscript, tables and the figure. We wish to express our appreciation for the efforts of the Editor and reviewers to improve the manuscript. Please find the point-to -point responses to the comments as follows:

Editor Comments:

1) Please remove the section heading "Recommendations" and incorporate this text into the Discussion.

Reply: Done, please refer to page no 17, line no 348 – 356.

2) After the Conclusion section, please include a list of abbreviations used in the manuscript.

Reply: Done, please refer to page no 19, line 366.
3) You have included Funding twice in the Declarations, both with different information. Please ensure that all sources of funding are included in one section. Please describe the role of the funding body in the design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript.

Reply: Done, please refer to page no 20, line no 404-405

4) Please remove the figure titles embedded within the figures and re-upload the corrected versions. All figure titles/legends should be placed at the end of the main manuscript, after the References, and not within any of the figure files. Please upload each Figure and Table individually, as separate files.

Reply: Done, all tables and the figure are submitted as separate files. Figure title mentioned after the references. Please refer to page number 32.

Reviewer 2 (Reviewer 2): "REVISION ASSESSMENT FROM THE ACADEMIC PEER REVIEWER:

Reviewer comments: Thank you for revising this paper so carefully. I think the manuscript is vastly improved. Take care with expression and get a native speaker to read over it to pick up syntax error."

Reply: The manuscript was sent for English correction to the Nature Research Editing Services. Please find the attached certificate for English language correction.

Research Square (Reviewer 3):

STATISTICAL REVIEWER COMMENTS:

The study has been well conducted with clear objectives except for the gender differentials. The discussion needs some improvements.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

1. While the objective is straightforward - to measure the gender differences in the probability of 10 year risk for CVD based on the FRS, etc. - no background of gender differentials have been mentioned. This is not the case of the second objective, where the background and rationale are well explained.
Reply: Suggestion taken. We have included the background information on the gender differences in context to CVD and risk factors. Please refer to page number 4, line no. 62 – 68.

2. The study invited twice as many females as males (2100 versus 1000), and the consented ones were 975 males and 2038 females. For a study with the objective to discuss gender differentials, it is important to know whether these are a norm or whether the females attend the hospitals twice as commonly as males? This could have implications on the results and should be discussed.

Reply: The females attend the PHCC more in number compared to the males because of the morning timings. However, we tried to overcome this by visiting the workplaces and enrolling eligible male participants. Please refer to methodology section, page no 6, line no 108 – 111. We developed separate independent multivariable models for the males and the female gender.

3. Line no. 256-258 in discussion. Is the reference number wrongly placed in the first sentence (because that seems to be a result of this paper itself) or am I missing something? Please edit for the sake of clarity.

Reply: Thank you for correcting us. Suggestion taken and editing done. Page no 13, line 256 - 259.

4. Line number 273-278. The way reference number 45 is being discussed needs to be contextualised. The referenced paper clearly points out the problems in applying FRS to PCI patients, as well as its limitations in other cases. The authors have done well to cite this paper, but they should consider rephrasing and explaining it for clarity as it is relevant to this research, in the light of FRS in PCI patients as well as others.

Reply: Suggestion taken. We have rephrased the sentence, please refer to page no 14, line 277 - 279.