

## **Response to reviewer's comments**

### **Reviewer 1: 02446525**

Conclusion: Accept

Classification: Grade C (Good)

Language Evaluation: Grade B: minor language polishing

Comments to authors: acceptable

**Author's response:** Thank you for accepting our manuscript. We have done language editing throughout the manuscript.

### **Reviewer 2: 02446542**

Conclusion: Minor revision

Classification: Grade A (Excellent)

Language Evaluation: Grade A: priority publishing

Comments to authors: The manuscript is well written and after some minor revision could be suitable for publication. First of all, the references should be presented according to journal guidelines. Secondly, the waist to hip ratio values are presented as "mm" since this index has no metric units. Moreover, it should be preferable to present the statistic methods of this meta-analysis in a separate section.

**Author's response:** Thank you for the appreciation. We have done the revisions as you have suggested. References have been presented as per the journal guidelines. Waist to hip ratio are presented in 'mm' throughout the manuscript has been corrected. Statistical method of meta-analysis is presented in a separate section.

### **Reviewer 3: 00506397**

Conclusion: Major revision

Classification: Grade C (Good)

Language Evaluation: Grade B: minor language polishing

Comments to authors: The authors present a meta-analysis of 18 studies that met the eligibility criteria to find the association of obesity with hypertension and type-2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM) in India. Based on their analysis the authors concluded that “despite methodological differences, obesity showed significant, potentially plausible association with hypertension and type 2 diabetes mellitus in studies in India. Being a modifiable risk factor, our study informs setting policy priority and intervention efforts to prevent debilitating complications.” Although the overall conclusion reached by the authors is reasonable, as currently presented, this manuscript has a number of deficiencies that need to be addressed, outlined below:

1. The authors have failed to follow the Format as outlined in the World Journal of Diabetes Instruction to Authors. This begins with the unorthodox style they have used to present the “Authors and their institutional affiliation”.

Thank you for reviewing our manuscript. We have made corrections in the formatting and followed the format as outlined by the World Journal of Diabetes. Authors name and their institutional affiliation has now corrected with the way of formatting.

2. There are numerous errors of “Tense and Grammar” throughout the manuscript. Therefore, a diligent editing is in order to fix the ENGLISH language.

Errors in the ‘Tense and Grammar’ throughout the manuscript has been corrected. English language editing has been done by the experts.

3. The authors have arbitrarily used UPPER CASE letters in some commonly known terms (e.g. type-2 diabetes, hypertension).

We have done the corrections with reference to use of Upper case wherever applicable and as mentioned by the reviewer.

4. In Materials and Method section, authors state that “Disagreements were resolved by consensus among both authors and arose on XXX occasions.” What does this information mean?

This sentence has been modified now and which means that when two authors were involved in literature review as per inclusion exclusion criteria, if they had doubt regarding with respect to inclusion/exclusion of particular study, they mutually left the decision to third author for the decision.

5. The Discussion and Conclusions sections are unnecessarily VERBOSE and the sentiments expressed in them are quite REDUNDANT. They can be reduced by HALF without losing the key points.

Sure. Thank you for the comment. Discussion and conclusion section has been revised and rewritten without missing any key points.

6. The FORMAT of FIGURES 2 and 3 needs to be consistent with each other.

Thank you for the comment. Formatting of figure 2 and 3 has been done as suggested

7. The information presented in TABLES 1 and 2 is UNNECESSARILY COMPLEX and should be better streamlined. For example, information about the study design (nearly all of them were cross-sectional), occupation and gender appears to be IRRELEVANT to the goals and final conclusions of these studies. Citations (authors and dates) outlined in the Tables are confusing and should be the same as in the BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Thank you for the comment. Revision in the tables has been done. Column with study design has been removed since majority are cross-sectional studies. Occupation and gender column of the study subjects has been removed. Citations in the tables have been corrected as suggested by the reviewer.

#### **Reviewer 4: 03699916**

Conclusion: Minor revision

Classification: Grade B (Very good)

Language Evaluation: Grade B: minor language polishing

Comments to Authors:

General comments: Association of obesity with hypertension and Type-2 Diabetes Mellitus is very important. There are many reports about this issue over the world. Here authors perform a meta-analysis of the association of obesity with hypertension and T2DM in India. They conclude that obesity showed significantly and potentially plausible association with hypertension and type 2 diabetes mellitus in studies in India. The present study adds a data from India to the database about the association of obesity with hypertension and diabetes especially Type 2 diabetes. Therefore, the manuscript is suitable for publication in WJD. However, the manuscript should be improved according to the comments below before accepting for publication in WJD. Specific minor comments:

1, About abstract: 1) Please spell out when you first time to use the abbreviation of NCD.

Thank you for reviewing our manuscript. Corrections have been done and abbreviations used for the first time are expanded in the abstract and manuscript.

2) Methods section lacks about how to analyze the data obtained from literature searching. The statistical analysis method is also missing.

Under the abstract, method section has been updated with statistical analysis of literature review.

2, About core tip: Core tip is needed to modify and rewrite in focusing on your results ad conclusion.

Core tip has been modified and rewritten as per the results obtained and conclusion drawn.

3, About Materials and methods:

1) Page 5, counting down the third and second lines: "...and waist to hip ratio ( $\geq 0.80$  mm for females and  $\geq 0.90$  mm for males) .". I don't think the waist to hip ratio has unit such as mm.

Thank for the inputs. Yes Ofcourse, unit for waist to hip ratio doesn't exist and it has been removed throughout the manuscript.

2) Page 5, counting down the second line: What is JNC VII criteria? Please provides a reference.

Thank you for the comment. JNC VII criteria is Joint National Committee criteria for classification of hypertension, widely used to classify hypertension in present days. Reference for this has been inserted.

3) About Pane 1, pane 2 and pane 3: Authors should choice either using tables or describing in normal way of text. Please do not use this inserting function.

Thank for the comment. Panel 1, Panel 2 and Panel 3 has been modified to table 1, table 2 and table 3

4) Page 8, counting down the fourth line: "We employed the following set of criteria to evaluate the of papers:". Please delete "of" just before papers.

Thank you for the input. It was a mistake. The word 'of' has been deleted before word 'paper'.

4, About the reference list: The format of references in the reference list is needed to modify according to the request of WJD.

Thank you for the comment. Reference formatting has been modified as per the guideline of WJD.

5, About figure 2 and figure 3: The resolution is too low and please modify them with improvement of resolution.

Thank you. Figure 2 and 3 has been modified with high resolution.