

**Table 6 - Prevalence estimates of the metabolic syndrome of some published studies compared to the GEMCAS population**

Country	Study name	Study cohort	Sample size	Age range	Definition	Prevalence %	GEMCAS, % (n) *	Reference
Korea	-	medical check-up based, Seoul + Kyung-Gi province	40,698	20-82	NCEP 2001 + medication	6.8 (10.9) <sup>†</sup>	20.2	[26]
China	InterASIA	nationwide	15,540	35-74	NCEP 2001 + medication	13.7 (15.8) <sup>†</sup>	23.3 (24,885)	[28]
Ireland	-	primary care, metropolitan (Cork and Kerry)	1,018	50-69	NCEP 2001	20.7	25.9 (12,432)	[14]
Italy	PAMELA	metropolitan (Monza)	2,013	25-74	(?)	16.2	19.7/21.5 <sup>‡</sup> (28,610)	[15]
France	-	working cohort		30-65	NCEP 2001	9.8	13.4 (13,277)	[16]
China, Hong Kong	-	metropolitan, working	1,513	18-66	NCEP 2001 + medication	9.6	12.0 (15,963)	[17]
Iran	Tehran Lipid and Glucose	metropolitan (Tehran)	10,368	>20	NCEP 2001	30.1	19.0	[13]
Great Britain	British Women's Heart and Health	general practices, metropolitan (23 British towns)	4,286	60-79	NCEP 2001 + medication	29.8	21.0 (18,4) <sup>§</sup>	[20]
Oman	Nizwa Healthy Life Style Project Survey	metropolitan (Nizwa)	1,419	>20	NCEP 2001 + medication	21.0	19.7	[9]
Greece	The MetS-Greece Multicentre	nationwide	4,153	>18	NCEP 2001 + medication	23.6	21.5	[11]
US	NHANES III (1988-1994)	nationwide	8,814	>20	NCEP 2001 + medication	23.7 (24.1) <sup>  </sup>	20.3	[18]
	NHANES (1999-2000)	nationwide	1,677	>20	NCEP 2001 + medication	27.0 (34.5) <sup>#</sup>	20.3	[19]

\* prevalence of the GEMCAS cohort estimated according to age range, sex employment status of the specific study population

<sup>†</sup> when an ethnicity adapted measure for obesity was used

<sup>‡</sup> depending on definition used (NCEP 2000/AHA 2004)

<sup>§</sup> these differences are even higher, since Lawlor et al. [20] modified the original NCEP-definition by using the HDL-C threshold for men (<1mmol/L instead of <1.3mmol/L for women). Applying this threshold to GEMCAS, only 18.4% of the women would have been classified as having MetSyn

<sup>||</sup> data in ( ) from same data set, but different publication [10]

<sup>#</sup> published in [10], probably different prevalences because of different sample sizes (n=3,601)