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Co-Editor in Chief: Natalie Pafitis

Dear Professor Natalie Pafitis,

I am writing to resubmit the manuscript, “An evaluation of the impact of aggressive hypertension, diabetes and smoking cessation management on CVD outcomes at the population level: a dynamic simulation analysis” for publication as a research paper in BMC Public Health.

I am grateful to the reviewers for the comments. The following edits have been made:

1. Minor edits for language in the discussion and throughout the manuscript have been made to improve readability;
2. Explained the model building process and the engagement of clinician stakeholders to verify the model structure and assumptions in the methods section.

All authors have contributed sufficiently to the project to be included as authors, and all those who are qualified to be authors are listed in the author byline. To the best of my knowledge, no conflict of interest, financial or other, exists.

Sincerely,

John P. Ansah

Assistant Professor
Reviewer comments:

Reviewer #1
Comment #1: No comments, paper is good for publication
Answer: Thank you for the comment.

Reviewer #2
Comment #1: The manuscript is well written.
Answer: Thank you for the comment.

Comment #2: May mention as well if stakeholder consultation was done or not as it is important to include stakeholders from the health care system in Singapore. This is important in deciding about the applicability of the simulation method to the health system in Singapore.
Answer: Thank you for the comment. We have added the text below to the methods section—under “the model structure; lines 86-92; page 4” to explain the model building process and how clinician stakeholders were involved in model validation.

“The model presented herein was developed as follows: first, a conceptual model was developed that simulated the behaviour of key outcomes using available data and information from literature. Next, the conceptual model was presented to clinicians with expert knowledge on CVD to verify the model structure and its assumptions regarding causal relationships. Following verification, the model was simulated, base-case scenarios was developed with other alternative policies. Therefore, the model is grounded on current knowledge and available evidence on the risk factors of CVD and interventions to prevent CVD events”.
Comment #3: Some minor edits for language in the discussion section (line 340-341)

Answer: Thanks for pointing out the error. We have edited the sentence as follows in the discussion section line 345; page 14:

“Policymakers must thus be increasingly proactive in implementing chronic disease policies that prioritize care continuity, with emphasis on screening, and effective management of hypertension and diabetes, in order to reduce the incidence, death and disability associated with CVD”.