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Editor-in-Chief

BMC Journal of Public Health

Attached please find the revised article “A Reversed Gender Pattern? A Meta-Analysis of Gender Differences in the Prevalence of Non-Suicidal Self-Injurious Behaviour Among Chinese Adolescents” (word count: 3436; tables 2; figures 1; references 31) as well as responses to the editor and reviewer. The paper was carefully revised according to all the constructive comments and suggestions of the editor and reviewer. As a result of these changes, page numbers of the paper may now be a little bit different from those in the original version.

Thank you for your consideration. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely

Xueyan Yang*, PhD, Institute for Population and Development Studies, School of Public Policy and Administration, Xi’an Jiaotong University, #28, Xianning Xi Road, Xi’an, Shaanxi Province
Thank you for your valuable comments on our paper. We have revised our paper to incorporate your constructive comments and suggestions. Below are the details of the revisions.

Editor Comments:

(1) Please include a title page at the front of your manuscript file. It should contain, at minimum, the names, institutions, countries and email addresses of all authors, and the full postal address of the submitting author

Addressed.

(2) Please provide separate sections for 'Discussion' and 'Conclusions'

Addressed.
Memorandum

To: Reviewer #1 (paragraphs in bold are your original comments).

Date: 24 May 2017

Thank you for your valuable comments on our paper. We have revised our paper to incorporate your constructive comments and suggestions. If you agree, we would like to include your name in the acknowledgement. Below are the details of the revisions.

Reviewer #1

Konrad Bresin (Reviewer 1): Overall the authors have done an excellent job addressing my concerns. In particular, I enjoyed the analyses looking at region. I just have a few minor points that I think would be worth addressing.

Actually, we have made a big improvement to this article according to your suggestions. If you agree, we would like to include your name in the acknowledgement.

In the introduction, I think it's worth making an argument for why it's worthwhile to look at gender and NSSI in China, given that there's already an international meta-analysis. It seems
like it would be easy to add a sentence noting that it's difficult to apply the results of Bresin & Schoenleber (2014) to China, given the gender differences in suicide in China.

Addressed. Please find the sentence in red on page 5.

I also think that the rural, urban, Hong Kong distinction should be brought up in the introduction not the method.

The classification of the three areas applied to only the middle school students rather than to all adolescents; therefore, we think it is more appropriate to explain it in the methodology part. We have added one sentence to address this in the introduction in order to echo the specific explanation in the method. Please find the sentence in red on page 5.

I think you should have a sentence in the method section explaining why you choose to do the odds ratio with >1 meaning a bias for men. Bresin & Schoenleber (2014) did it the opposite way, so it's worth noting for people to not get confused across papers.

Addressed. Please find the sentence in red on pages 9–10.

I think that there's a typo in relation to the clinical samples. In the abstract and paper, you report, "(OR = 0.50, 95% CI = [0.42, 0.60], p > 0.1)". Either the CI or the p is wrong, because if 1 isn't in the interval the p-value should be less than .05.

Yes, you are right. We have checked the results and found that we made a mistake. The accurate result should be ‘(OR = 0.88, 95% CI = [0.41, 1.89], p > 0.1)’.

In the discussion in the last paragraph on page 12. I think you could add a sentence tying the rural versus urban results to the gender conflict because to me it seems to support your case. Maybe I'm missing something though.

Yes, we have included this sentence to state the viewpoint that you suggested. Please find the sentence in red on page 15.