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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor of BMC MIDM,

Please find enclosed our revised manuscript “Metabolic syndrome in hypertensive women in the age of menopause: A case study on data from General Practice Electronic Health Records“, by Sefket Sabanovic, et al.

First of all, thank you on your clear and concise suggestions for improvements that served us as a good guide for producing the requested revision.

Being aware of the complexity of the matter, we have completely rewritten the text by taking care on the structure of the manuscript as a whole and the structure and the length of the sentences in particular. The changes to the first draft are provided for your insight, although we have made many further refinements and adjustments that are not possible to display unless making the document unreadable.

To ensure the spelling and grammar are correct, we have also used the advantage of your on-line professional English language editing service.

We are convinced that we have succeeded in achieving the satisfied level of English and the structure of the text, to allow smart follow up of objectives, procedures and comments provided.
Below we provide a detailed list of changes and answers on your enquiries.

1) On your enquiry to include a set of research questions and evaluation diagrams, so it is easier to understand what is the goal and how it is going to be achieved – we included a short and concise “Objectives“ subsection at the end of the Background section. On many sites throughout the Methods, Results and Discussion sections, where appropriate, we included short comments to link the methods used for analysis with objectives and/or the results achieved.

2) We have not used the section and subsection numbering, to avoid the overburden of the text and to be in accordance with the journal’s recommendations for the manuscript preparation. Nevertheless, we believe that we have succeeded in achieving the clarity of the paper’s structure by improvements made in the structure and organisation of the text.

For this purpose also, we have reshaped the headings of the Discussion section, thus making the organisation of this section more concise and easier to understand.

In addition, according to your suggestion, we have broken the Background section into Background and Motivation for the study.

3) According to your recommendation, we have added two new illustrations into the Methods section (now enumerated as Fig. 2 and 3), to condense this section and make it easier to follow up.

For the same purpose, to support a smart following up, we have included a new table (now signed as a Table 3) in the section Method, subsection Data set description.

4) The main findings and suggestions for general praticioners, we have organised as an independent subsection, that we have placed at the end of the Discussion section and named as: “Practical protocol, for use in GP, for fast recognition and preventive management of menopausal women at high CV risk“. This way, the previous subsections: A review of the results, Limitations of the study, Generalizability of the results and conclusion, are now divided between this new subsection and the Conclusions.

5) According to the changes made throughout the manuscript, there was a need to justify the order of the citations in the text and the references in the reference list. We have also taken some references to drop out and some new ones to be included (signed with the red colour in the reference list of the first draft).

6) Our team of informaticians from Slovakia improved the resolution of the graphics (except for the figures of the DT rules, that represent the original computer outputs).

7) The abstract was shortened within the recommended limit of 350 words.

8) The professor Holzinger team was asked to provide the final lecturing.
This paper has originated from our previous work and represents a novel and innovative approach to research. In fact, to our knowledge, our team was the first, at all, who have started practicing this research approach, based on a single-site study and on using a comprehensive data set and multiple methods for data analysis.

The great potential of this paper, if published, would be expected especially in the GP setting, for improving its research capacity and practice, as well in Europe, as worldwide.

We believe our findings would appeal to the readership of the BMC MIDM journal. With this in mind, we are sending you our revised manuscript to consider it for further processing.

Best regards,

Andreas Holzinger, for the authors

The manuscript is original and not published before nor is it in consideration for publishing elsewhere. All authors read and approved the final manuscript and there are no conflicts of interests.