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Author’s response to reviews:

To the editors,

We have made the following two changes to our manuscript, as requested.

RESPONSE TO EDITOR COMMENTS:

1. Please clarify whether any minors (16+) were included in the patient sample in the methods section of your manuscript. If so, please clarify in the Ethics approval and consent to participate section whether consent was obtained from a parent or guardian on behalf of any participants under the age of 16.

   RESPONSE: Information about the age of eligibility was added to our methods section, which indicates that only participants aged 16 or over were eligible for the study. 16 is the age of legal consent in China.

2. Currently, we are unable to access the link (http://www.seshglobal.org/data/) you have provided in the ‘Availability of data and material’ section. Please ensure that the correct link has been provided and is accessible.

   RESPONSE: The website at which data for this study can be accessed has been corrected.
3. Consent for publication refers to consent for the publication of identifying images or other personal or clinical details of participants that compromise anonymity. Seeing as this is not applicable to your manuscript please state “Not Applicable” in this section.

RESPONSE: This change was made to the relevant section.

4. At this stage, please upload your manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colours. All relevant tables/figures/additional files should also be clean versions. Figures (and additional files) should remain uploaded as separate files.

RESPONSE: A clean version of the manuscript has replaced the former one.

We thank the editors for suggesting these improvements to the manuscript, and are happy to answer any further questions.

Best regards,

M Kumi Smith, MPIA, PhD
University of North Carolina Chapel Hill