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Author’s response to reviews:

Responses to reviewer comments:

Editor comments:

- Your manuscript (including the title and abstract) would benefit from further editing during revision.

Response: Following revision based on reviewer comments, the revised manuscript has been critically edited for English grammar and syntax.

Reviewer #1:

- This is an interesting and potentially useful piece of work. It is mostly well written, though I note some places where the text should be amended. This is not exhaustive and the authors should review the whole text again to satisfy themselves that it is easily readable. Generally, it should be published pending some relatively minor corrections.
Response: Agreed. The revised manuscript has been critically edited for English grammar and syntax.

- The discussion could be trimmed somewhat compared with the rest of the paper it is a bit overlong, and seems to unbalance the paper.
Response: Agreed. The discussion part has been shortened. The word count of the discussion in the revised manuscript has been reduced by about 370 words.

- Finally, the authors could examine the 'obesity paradox' in more detail the inclusion of a univariate (or minimally adjusted) analysis may have helped elucidate this.
Response: Agreed. A univariate analysis was performed and the results have been shown in Table 3. Accordingly, in both univariate and multivariate analysis, being overweight or obese, were associated with the lower risk of premature mortality events. These results have been added to the text (Page 5, Results section, line 22-25, page 7, line 27, and Table 3).

- page 3: line 8 'to the' .. 'to be the'; line 13  'in Tehran' .. 'in a Tehran';
Response: Agreed done. (Page 3, Background section, lines 8 and 13)

- line 18: 'population based' usually treated as a compound word as elsewhere in the paper 'population based'
Response: Agreed done (Page 3, Background section, line 22; and page 6, Discussion section, line 27).

- same with 'follow up' .. follow up' (line 27)
Response: Agreed. We have corrected the word throughout the entire manuscript.

- line 26, and elsewhere: given that they are looking at deaths before the age 70.. it is more correct to say '30-69 years'
Response: Agreed done (Page 3, Background section, line 26).
- The sentence beginning 'In the first phase..' is probably too long at eight lines. The authors should consider breaking it up into two or three sentences. This will make it more immediately understandable. Also, maybe the clinical definitions could be presented more succinctly as a small table, with a shortened text.

Response: Agreed. Definition of terms has been presented in Table 1.

- line 13: 'categorized' .. 'categorize'

Response: The word “categorized” has been deleted, because definition of terms has been presented in Table 1.

- page 5: line 11 'as event' .. 'as the event'; line 13 'who lost'.. 'who were lost'

Response: Agreed done (page 4, Statistical methods, lines 21 and 23).

- line 16: 'age as time scale' – clarify

Response: Thank you. We have added a sentence to clarify the time scale (page 4, Statistical methods section, lines 26-27).

- Results

line 26 page 6: the OR associated with obesity should be flagged as indicative only it is not significant.

Response: Agreed. We have corrected the sentence (page 6, Results section, lines 11-13).

- page 7 line 21: case control and cross sectional should both be hyphenated Cross sectional and case control

Response: Agreed done (page 6, Discussion section, lines 22-23).

- line 23: 'conducted a' should be 'conducted using a.. cohort study design'

Response: Agreed done (page 6, Discussion section, line 25).
- page 8 line 7: comma after 'prevention' and comma after patients.
  Response: Agreed done (page 7, Discussion section, lines 6 and 7).

- line 11: hyphenate Middle aged
  Response: Agreed done (page 7, Discussion section, line 10).

- line 12: 'risk reached to null' .. confusing .. do the authors mean 'became non significant'.. ?
  Response: The sentence has been removed.

- line 20: 'a favourable trend for the rate of smoking' .. confusing.. could the authors clarify.
  Response: It means the prevalence of smoking increased significantly among adult Tehranian populations. We have modified the sentence (page 7, Discussion section, line 18-19).

- line 22: should be 'Muller et al' and maybe the year of publication in brackets
  Response: Agreed done (page 7, Discussion section, line 19).

- line 26: 'PAF that' .. should be 'PAF than'..
  Response: The paragraph has been removed during the edition.

- page 9 line 6: as with Muller et al above
  Response: we have modified the sentence (page 8, Discussion section, lines 1-2).

- line 12: 'dose response'
  Response: The paragraph has been removed during the edition.
- line 20: 'Iranian individuals'

Response: Agreed done (page 8, Discussion section, line 11).

Reviewer #2:

- "Regarding risk factors for premature mortality events smoking was demonstrated to the predominant risk factor for premature mortality" Comment: Please rephrase this sentence for clarity.

Response: Agreed done (Background section, page 3, line 8).

- In the Methods Section: "The remaining 8063 participants (80.23% of eligible sample) were followed up until end of this study (20 March 2014)."In the Results Section: "The study population consisted of 7245 persons (3216 men)"

Comment: Please reconcile the differences between these numbers

Response: Thank you for your attention. We have corrected the error (page 4, Method section, line 1).

- "Furthermore, about 50% of all cause mortality was attributable to CVD mortality."Comment: This was not a finding in this study. So, I don't believe that this conclusion should be reached.

Response: Agreed. The whole sentences have been omitted (page 9, Conclusion section).