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Author’s response to reviews:

We thank the reviewer for the valuable feedback. We have addressed the reviewer’s comments below and included the revised manuscript.

"The submitted manuscript is potentially another nail in the coffin towards global abandoning dipstick haematuria as an urological investigation. Few studies deal with this potentially healthy cohort to estimate the true presence in urologically healthy population. The manuscript is well written and it is unfortunately too late to do changes to the simple easily understood design. However, if this should be published, the most important limitation of the study should be highlighted more and also incorporated in the abstract as it is essential for interpretation of the findings: There is no investigation nor follow-up of patients with positive dipstick!"

Our paper was to emphasize the prevalence of hematuria on dipstick analysis and factors associated with it. Importantly, the objective was not to address the consequence and findings from investigations based on finding of hematuria on dipstick. Nevertheless, as suggested by the reviewer, we highlighted the reviewer’s above mentioned limitation in both the abstract and discussion section.

In the abstract, we added the following (yellow highlight):

“Limitation of this study is the lack of follow-up and knowledge of subsequent investigations of patients.”

Similarly in the discussion section (yellow highlight):

“….importantly, follow-up data was not available for our patient population to identify if these patients ultimately underwent full workup and their findings.”