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Dear editor,

I am so apologized for the delay of response. Thank you very much for the informative comments from you and reviewer Altan Onat. We have studied the paper you mentioned and rewritten our Discussion section (Page 8, Paragraph 3-4).
Reviewer: Altan Onat

Reviewer's report:

The manuscript has been improved considerably. But much more clarity is required in presenting and interpreting main findings. The salient finding is that, although total (and LDL-) cholesterol levels were similar in diabetic males, regardless of dichotomized TSH concentrations, cholesterol levels were significantly lower in diabetic females in the low-TSH euthyroid group and in the multivariable regression analysis.

The discussion should clearly separate relations in the general population from those among diabetic people since diabetes confounds most relationships observed among apparently healthy subjects. Lower TSH in diabetic women associated with lower cholesterol can well be attributed to two phenomena: a) Lower total (and LDL-) cholesterol levels commonly precede autoimmune-initiated processes – be it oxidatively-damaged TSH or rheumatoid arthritis (Myasoedova E, et al. Ann Rheum Dis. 2010; 69:310-4) or diabetes (Onat A. Expert Rev Cardiovasc Ther 2014;12:667); b) TSH incurring epitope damage escapes immunoassay and is measured as “lower”.

Yes this is a good advice. It is not suitable in our paper to mix diabetic people and general population together. And we have removed the contents about general population (studies and reference) from our discussion section (Page 8, Paragraph 3-4) and background section (Page 4, Paragraph 1).

Then reviewer gave us a good advice to explain our result better. We have studied the references you mentioned carefully and added this content to our discussion section (Page 8, Paragraph 4)

In Table 2, correction is needed regarding data for males which have been designated as females.

Yes this was a mistake. It had been corrected (Page 16, Line 11).
Thanks again to you for the thoughtful and thorough review. Hopefully we have addressed all of your concerns. If there are any problems, please don’t hesitate to tell us.

Best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

ZHANG Yun