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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’s comments

Major Compulsory Revisions:

I think there is a problem in the interpretation of data in this study.

Firstly, I would like to state that an odds ratio of less than 1 is protective and greater than one indicates risk. The authors indicate that there was a clear gender difference in the association between SES and obesity. From their findings, being a woman, the person has a higher risk of being abdominally obese (OR 1.08, and this was not statistically significant) compared to a man. However, the same data indicate that being a woman is protective (OR 0.77) against overweight/obesity. It is important to state the parameter of obesity (BMI or waist circumference, WC) which is associated to SES.

Reply: we thank you for your suggestions. We think your comments are correct and helpful. So we have rewritten this parts of the results in the article and are marked in red.

Secondly, the association between SES and obesity was statistically significant only when BMI was used for the female population, meanwhile a significant
association was observed in males for both parameters (BMI and WC).

Reply: Thanks for your comments. We have accepted your suggestions and modified them in the Manuscript.

Thirdly, the authors are talking about prevalence in Table 3. The frequencies (prevalence) of overweight/obesity and abdominal obesity in the different categories of education level for example, are not indicated in Table 3. I do not understand why they have to say (line 212 to 215) that among youngest participants, the medium and high educational level participants had a higher prevalence of overweight/obesity compared to those of the low education level. Did the authors want to say that these participants (medium and high education groups) are at risk of being overweight/obese compared to those at a low educational level? Or, if the authors intended to say that belonging to the medium and high education groups are associated to higher frequencies (prevalence) of overweight/obesity, then it will be nice to also include the frequencies of overweight/obesity to the corresponding categories of the different variables in Table 3.

Reply: Thank you for pointing out this errors. In the results, we want to say that these participants (medium and high education groups) are at risk of being overweight/obese compared to those at a low educational level. Thus, we have corrected them in the parts of the results in the manuscript. On the other hand, we have provided the frequencies of overweight/obesity to the corresponding categories of the different variables in Table 2.