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**Author’s response to reviews:**

Thank you very much for your careful and useful comments, and my sincere reply are as follows

**Technical Comments:**

**Editor Comments:**

It is necessary to enlist the services of professional English grammar expert to improve the coherency and quality of the English language and grammar in your manuscript. Failure to improve the understandability will mean that BMC Endocrine Disorders will not consider your manuscript for publication.

Reply: We got helps from Editage (www.editage.cn) for English language editing.
Reviewer reports:


This is uncorrect: Elda Katia Silvia Tommaso and Daniele are first name and need to be shortened: Kara E. Cioni K...

The reference has been updated as follows (line 17, page 13):


There are still too many typing errors, I confirm the paper is interesting but a mothertongue revision is needed before publication.

Reply : We got language helps from Editage (www.editage.cn) for English language editing.

Reviewer 2 (Reviewer 2): PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses one or several testable research questions? (Brief or other article types: is there a clear objective?)

Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

No - there are minor issues
EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with sufficient technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

No - there are minor issues

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?

Yes - appropriate statistical analyses have been used in the study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

Yes - the author's interpretation is reasonable

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? If not, can further revisions be made to make the work technically sound?

Probably - with minor revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: It is improved but still needs work.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

The authors have made several improvements in the paper but they really did not address my point #2 about how they selected and defined their vitamin D deficient group.

reply : In the Study Design section (lines 14–16, page 5), we stated that the "Control groups were selected from a community-based, cross-sectional study conducted in Sichuan Province, China."
Furthermore, in the study population section (line 27, page 5), we stated that ”individuals with 25OHD less than 20 ng/ml were defined as deficient in vitamin D”;

They did add metric units to Table 1 as I suggested but need to be consistent with using both metric and SI units in both Methods and Table 1.

reply:In the study population section (line 27, page 5), we stated ”25OHD less than 20ng/ml” and”All healthy control subjects had a normal serum PTH concentration (normal laboratory range: 14.5-62.7pg/mL). (lines 29, page 5)”

Also would be helpful to provide normal ranges in Table 1 which should be similar to the healthy controls.

reply:The normal ranges have been added to the table as requested.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

I think they should round off the cutoff for the PF index to 34 instead of 33.98. Having 2 decimals suggests a precision that this type of analysis does not possess.

Reply:The cutoff for the PF index has been changed to 34 instead of 33.98 in the Results and Discussion and in Tables 2 and 3.

Thanks very much!