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Author’s response to reviews:

James Mockridge, PhD

Editor, BMC Endocrine Disorders

Berlin, November 23, 2018

Dear Dr. Mockridge,

Thank you for your positive feedback of our manuscript entitled "Association between random glucose and all-cause mortality: Findings from the mortality follow-up of the German National Health Interview and Examination Survey 1998" (BEND-D-18-00176).

We uploaded a revised manuscript with a statement about the role of funding bodies as well as the tables as separate files.
We again thank the reviewers for their comments and suggestions which greatly improved our manuscript. Please find below a point-by-point response providing responses to each reviewer/editorial point:

Editor Comments:

1) Please describe the role of the funding body in the design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript should be declared.

We added the following declaration to the Funding section (page 23, line 8-9): “The funding bodies stated above had no role in either the design of the study, the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data or in writing the manuscript.”

2) In accordance with our Submission Guidelines (https://bmcendocrdisord.biomedcentral.com/submission-guidelines/preparing-your-manuscript#preparing+tables), please do not include shading in the tables and upload the tables as separate, individual files.

We omitted the shading in the tables and uploaded the three tables as separate, individual files.

3) At this stage, please upload a single final, clean version of the manuscript that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colours.

We uploaded a single final, clean version of the manuscript that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colours.

Reviewer reports:
Richard F Gillum (Reviewer 1): The authors have addressed the concerns of the reviewers resulting in an improved submission.

We thank the reviewer for his positive feedback.

Reviewer 2 (Reviewer 2): "REVISION ASSESSMENT FROM THE ACADEMIC PEER REVIEWER:

Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? Yes

Reviewer comments: This is a well done piece of work.

I thought it was interesting that the J shape was lost when the authors removed smokers etc but I agree the numbers are small

We thank the reviewer for his positive feedback and are pleased that he agreed that the numbers regarding removing smokers from the analyses were too small.

We look forward to hear from you and hope that the revised manuscript is acceptable for publication.

With best regards,

Dr. Christa Scheidt-Nave