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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Professor Herman Van Oyen:

Thank you for your kind letter on October 2, 2019. We revised the manuscript in accordance with the reviewer’s and Editor-in-Chief’s comments, and carefully proof-read the manuscript to minimize typographical, grammatical, and bibliographical errors.

Here below is our description on revision according to the reviewer's comments:

Part A (Reviewer 1)

Comments:

① I recommend the authors to revise the presentation style for PR with respective 95% CI. The tables' presentation might need revision particularly the p-value columns can be replaced by *.

② Discussion: The strengths should be methodological but yours seems significance of the study. It has to be revised.

③ Conclusion section: It is recommended to include the practical implications of your finding and recommendation rather than listing factors.

④ Abstract:
Conclusion sub-section: it is better to include key recommendation to relevant respective personnel's/organization.

Line 275: please check whether the written abbreviation is correctly written or not. Avoid unnecessary semicolon there in the whole section of abbreviation.

Reply:

Thank you for your suggestion, all your suggestions are very important, they have important guiding significance for my thesis writing and research work!

① I am so sorry that I do not quite understand the meaning of PR. I personally understand it as pooled results. If this is the case, I have used 95% for the expression, and I adjusted and merged the table, and the P-value is represented by *.

② Considering your suggestions and the need for research content, we have made the following changes to the discussion section: Compared to the significance of the research, we have used more space to highlight the methodological advantages of WHtR in CKD prediction. Including WHtR's remedies for the inadequacies of several other indicators, such as it adjusts the influence of height, as well as the difference in muscle mass and the bias caused by abdominal obesity; it also describes the convenience and ease of operation of WHtR in the measurement and calculation process, which can effectively alleviate the cumbersome operation and insufficient staff resources in large-scale epidemiological investigations.

③ We have partially revised the conclusions, including the advantages of WHtR for predicting CKD through the results of the study, and with reference to other people's research, explaining that fundamentally controlling obesity is a means of preventing the development of CKD compared to prediction[1].

Reference:


④ The conclusions have been made in the above section in the revision for Major comments, and the 275 line references have been corrected and corrected.

Thank you again for your advice and hope to learn more from you!
Part B (Reviewer 2)

Comments:

① Please redo the background section of abstract since it does not truly present background but merely the aims.

② On introduction authors state "Chronic kidney disease (CKD) is a relatively common disease. According to statistics,". Which statistics? Databases? National surveys?

③ On sentences: "Population census showed[6]: Two-thirds of adult Americans have excess body mass, and half of them are obese." I believe these should be merged

④ Why did authors not include "obesity" on keywords?

⑤ I believe that if authors consider inclusion criteria being &gt; than 18, it is redundant to exclude those with &lt; than 18

⑥ On the exclusion criteria: "duplicate publication or use of the data has been crossed literature only a more comprehensive report." Please clarify

⑦ On results: "The nine studies included were mainly from East Asia and Europe". I would place her how many were from each region

⑧ On results: "The nine studies included were mainly from East Asia and Europe, the study was", please correct to "the studies were conducted from 2003 to 2015"

Reply:

Thank you very much for reminding. Your advice has benefited us a lot!

① I am sorry that my previous statement was incorrect. We have already enriched and modified the background section.

② The description of this section is derived from several cross-sectional surveys, all of which are listed in the text[2-4].

Reference:


3 According to your suggestion, I have merged the sentences, meaning that two-thirds of adults in the United States are overweight, and half of the overweight people are already obese.

4 Obesity has been ranked second by me as a keyword.

5 Thanks for your reminder, we have found that the repeated expressions of this description included in the exclusion criteria have been revised to exclude the (subjects included people under the age of 18).

6 It means if there are duplicate studies or data, we only choose the one with more comprehensive report content. I have corrected it in the manuscript.

7 I have corrected this and explained that the 9 studies included include 201428 objects from East Asia and 855 from Europe.

8 I have made the appropriate changes in the text according to your suggestions.

Thank you for your suggestion. It is very important. Because of your suggestions, I have found some shortcomings in my current work. I will improve your research level and get more achievements in accordance with your suggestions in future work!

Part C (Editor-in-Chief)

Comments:

1 Study period end in 2015. Did you verify that in the last 4 yrs, there were no new publications that should be included in the review. If not, I urge you to do so, as current data are already old.

2 Table numbering should be reviewed

3 All titles of the tables and figures should include information on the study

4 The title of figure one should refer to the reference of the Prisma guidelines

5 Before using an abbreviation the full text should be given also in the abstract

6 I’m missing a visual presentation of the results using a Peto graph. Also no funnel plot is provided (as supplementary information)

Reply:
Thank you very much for your letter and advice on my manuscript, it helps me a lot.

①We have re-searched the keywords and the retrieval time is from build the database up to now. We found that since the study in 2015, only one article[5] had the possibility to be included, but after careful reading of the abstract and the full text, we finally excluded the study because it was inconsistent with the research content.


②We have re-examined the table number and made some modifications.

③We have checked and modified all the titles of the tables and figures.

④We have inserted relevant references into the search process with reference to the Prisma guidelines.

⑤The abbreviations used in the manuscript have been supplemented in the abstract section.

⑥We used the inverse variance method to analyze this article, but did not use the Peto method, so I am sorry that the Peto diagram may not be presented. At the same time, according to the introduction of the Cochrane Handbook: as a rule of thumb, tests for funnel plot asymmetry should be used only when there are at least 10 studies included in the meta-analysis, because when there are fewer studies the power of the tests is too low to distinguish chance from real asymmetry. so we did not choose the subjective factor-dominated funnel chart, but chose the exact P-value of the egger's test. If necessary, we will still provide a corresponding funnel chart and the intuitive asymmetry is not a publication bias, which may be due to heterogeneity.

Many grammatical and typographical errors have been revised. All the lines and pages indicated above are in the revised. Thank you and all reviewers for the kind advice. We hope that the revision is acceptable and look forward to hearing from you soon. If you have any question about this paper, please don’t hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,

Ling Liu