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Author's response to reviews:

Dear editor,

RE: MS: 4964834381303880-Association of obesity with socioeconomic status among adults of ages 18 to 80 years in rural Northwest China

We are really grateful to yours and other reviewers’ critical comments and thoughtful suggestions. We have considered these comments and suggestions carefully. All changes made to the text are marked in red in MS Word. This manuscript has been edited and proofread by Medjaden Bioscience Limited. We hope the new manuscript will meet your magazine’s standard. Below you will find our point-to-point responses to the reviewers’ comments/questions:

Reviewer: Lifoter Navti’ comments

Major Compulsory Revisions:

1. It is good the authors have used three categories of SES as I suggested in my last report because of the large sample. It would also be nice for the authors to state the reason for using the middle income category as the reference group in the logistic regression analysis. Many studies in developing or transitional economies that have been published have used either the low income group as the reference group (to demonstrate that those in the middle or high income group are at risk) or the high income group as a reference group (to demonstrate that belonging to the middle or low income group is protective). If there is no reason, I would suggest to the authors to use either the low or high income group as reference group. This may give a clearer picture of the association between overweight/obesity and SES.

Reply: Thanks for your constructive suggestions. We decide to accept your suggestions and have rewritten the manuscript.

Minor Essential Revisions:

2. Line 98: .......... who were recruited ..................
3. Line 129: ………… Define overweight/obesity and abdominal obesity …………

4. Line 185: please take off ‘in men’ because line 184 already indicates that the information concerns men.

5. Line 209: ……….. but the relationship between education and abdominal obesity was not determined.

6. Line 218: …………, we also observed that participants …………..

7. Line 227: Among female participants ………………..

8. Line 241: please take off ‘than men’ at the end of the sentence.

9. Line 304: ….. while more women stay at home and occupy themselves with farming.

Reply: We are sorry for this errors and very grateful for reviewer’s help. Accordingly, the revisions are made in the manuscript.

Reviewer: Estrella Miqueleiz’s comments

Previous review:

2. It would be interesting to conduct a logistic regression to see the relationship between obesity relationship and SEP adjusted for risk factors analyzed in the study, to see whether the differences observed between SEP and obesity may be due to differences observed between SEP and risk factors. You have done a logistic regression between SES and obesity and in the other hand between SES and risk factors adjusted by sociodemographic factors, I would suggest to do a multivariate logistic regression between SES and obesity adjusted by risk factors.

Reply: Thanks for your help. According to your suggestions, we have done a multivariate logistic regression between SES and obesity adjusted by risk factors.

New suggestions:

1. With the new logistic regression suggeted, I would suggest to sumarize the tables. You can combine the tables 3 to 6 in two tables because if you adjust the regression by age, you don´t need to separate the data.

Reply: Your comments are valuable. We have combined the tables 3 to 6 in two tables in the article.

2. I suggest to revise the redaction for the text. In some cases, it results a bit confuse, there are too much data in the text.

Reply: Thanks for your suggestions. We have try my best to make some modifications for the text to eliminate confusion.

3. Line 274: I suggest to put more actual references.

Reply: We think your comments are correct. Accordingly, we have added some actual references in the manuscript.