Dear editor:

Thank you for your letter and for the comments from the statistician concerning our manuscript (Manuscript No.: BMJ-2019-052342.R1). I am grateful for the opportunity to revise our manuscript. All of the authors have carefully discussed about these comments and we have done our best to improve the manuscript. Our response are as follows:

1. I noticed that, following a reviewer's suggestion, you switched the term 'uncertainty intervals' to 'confidence intervals'. You argue the use of uncertainty intervals in this context but switch to confidence intervals to satisfy the reviewer comment. We have been pondering the issue and would prefer that you go back to 'uncertainty intervals', because you produce the intervals from the percentiles of the distribution drawn.

Response: Thank you for your suggestion. "confidence interval" has been changed back to "uncertainty interval" in the revised version.

2. This is an improvement on the original version and all my comments have been addressed. While the heat maps are visually good to look at, the addition of the numerical results for each of the countries is a welcome addition for global readers in Supplementary Table 3. The results are however presented as estimate, UCI, LCI. It would seem more natural to present the LCI followed by UCI.

Response: Thank you for your suggestion. We have changed the order of LCI and UCI to make it more natural in the revised supplemental table 3.

3. There are a number of grammatical errors. From a stats view, P value should be p-value. I would also not include '=' for results - I would marry the results in line with the text. Also please make it clear what the units are when talking about all results, e.g. add that it a percentage if that is what it is.

Response: Thank you for the valuable suggestion. We have put our best effort into finding and correcting the grammatical errors.

Xiaochen Li