Author’s response to reviews

Title: Whole grain food diet slightly reduces cardiovascular risks in obese/overweight adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Authors:

Weihao Wang (wangweihaoedu@126.com)
Jianan Li (m18612017283@163.com)
Xiaoxi Chen (chenxiaoxi@fuwai.com)
Miao Yu (happy_yumiao@163.com)
Qi Pan (panqi621@126.com)
Lixin Guo (glxwork2016@163.com)

Version: 3 Date: 16 Dec 2019

Author’s response to reviews:

Thanks for all the editors’ and reviewers’ comments about this manuscript. All the answers are as follows:

1. Q: Technical Comments- No List of Abbreviations
   R: We have added the list of the abbreviations. (line 262)

2. Q: Line 246-247: As far as I know, increased LDL is not included in the metabolic syndrome criteria. And HDL cholesterol should be low. Please correct!
   R: We have corrected it.

3. Q: Were case reports excluded or included? Please clarify!
   R: Case reported were all excluded. We only include RCTs.
Response to Reviewer 1:

1. Q: The authors have revised the paper. However, I still see in the abstract that they claim that whole grain consumption is associated with lower LDL-chol (with a p=0.05), whereas this is not true in statistical terms. Thus, the results concerning LDL-chol should be moved among those results where non-significant differences were observed. The authors could show a significant effect only on body weight and CRP. Since this is a meta-analysis, the statistical inference is not irrelevant. I recommend modifying the abstract, results, discussion and conclusions in order to give a fair message to the reader. After this implementation I will have no further comments.

R: We have revised it. LDL-c were moved among those significant results and other places.

Response to Reviewer 2:

1. Q: However, the subgroup analyses are still inadequately presented in this reviewer's opinion. The authors have clarified that subgroup analyses were undertaken by 'positive or negative' (statistically significant or non-significant) results. The explanation is that this is to investigate sources of heterogeneity. However, no presentation of such investigation is presented in the results. There is some discussion of this in the Discussions section, but some analysis of such differences needs to be done and included in the Results section.

R: Our aim of subgroup analysis is to investigate sources of heterogeneity and our subgroup classification method was according to positive or negative results. It’s not a conflict according to the opinion from our statistical staff.

2. Q: It is also very difficult to read the revision in the absence of a clean version given the vast number of tracked-changes made.

R: Sorry about that. We will provide a clean version of revised manuscript.