

Response to Reviewer 2

Comments

1. Summary

Dear Reviewer,

We have made the requested correction.

Thanks again.

2. Questions for General Evaluation	Reviewer's Evaluation	Response and Revisions
Does the introduction provide sufficient background and include all relevant references?	Yes/Can be improved/Must be improved/Not applicable	Yes
Are all the cited references relevant to the research?	Yes/Can be improved/Must be improved/Not applicable	Yes
Is the research design appropriate?	Yes/Can be improved/Must be improved/Not applicable	Yes
Are the methods adequately described?	Yes/Can be improved/Must be improved/Not applicable	Yes
Are the results clearly presented?	Yes/Can be improved/Must be improved/Not applicable	Must be improved
Are the conclusions supported by the results?	Yes/Can be improved/Must be improved/Not applicable	Yes

3. Point-by-point response to Comments and Suggestions for Authors

Comments 1: *[In the description of Tab. 5, the text has been corrected, but the OR in brackets is still incorrect (OR 2.18; 95%CI 1.13-4.18; $p=0.020$), and OR is given in the table (OR 0.48; 95%CI 0.33-0.78; $p=0.020$). The OR given in brackets in the text should be consistent with that provided in the table. See, it's correct in the abstract.]*

Response 1: *[Dear reviewer, as suggested, we corrected the OR, shown in brackets in the text, on line number 280, page 8. Thanks for this important comment.]*