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Author’s response to reviews:

Response to Reviewers' Comments

We are grateful to the Editor and Reviewers for the critical comments and expert advices. Following your suggestions, we have polished our manuscript. The changes are highlighted in red.

Reviewer reports:

Youjie Wang (Reviewer 1): include a brief description that there was no difference between excluded and included sample. For example (tweak the language as appropriate): 209,951 participants were excluded, 70,041 participants were included. By comparing the main
characteristics, we found no difference between the included and excluded population. The specific characteristics of the excluded and included groups are as following: age: 28.4 ± 4.8 vs. 28.4 ± 4.1, P = 0.291; BMI: 21.1 ± 3.0 vs. 21.0 ± 2.9, P = 0.236; plasma glucose, 4.5± 0.5 vs. 4.5± 0.4, P = 0.342; Systolic blood pressure, 107.6 ± 10.4 vs. 107.5 ± 10.7, P =0.443; Diastolic blood pressure, 65.7 ± 7.8 vs. 65.6 ± 7.9, P =0.551; Education (≤ 9 years), 24.1% vs. 23.5%, P = 0.360; Family history of diabetes, 2.7% vs. 2.6%, P = 0.523; Family history of hypertension, 6.4% vs. 6.4%, P = 0.481

Author’s response: Thank you very much for your expert comments. We had revised our paper following your suggestion (Results section, page 6).

please include this as one of the study limitations (Maybe combined it with the 3rd limitation in the current manuscript “Thirdly, this study was restricted to a medium-sized city in China with a relatively developed economy. However, data on income or job type was not collected. Therefore, the profile of socioeconomic status of the study population was not clearly known. And the results may not be generalizable to other socioeconomic groups.”):

Author’s response: Thank you very much for your expert comments. We had revised our paper following your suggestion (Discussion section, page 12).