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RESPONSE TO REVIEWER’S REPORT

REVIEWER 1[Dr Familoni]

Comment no 2: The sample size is very small! I appreciate that the total population is small but even then 104 is less than 10% of the 1000+ population

Response: Sir, the estimated population of the entire population was 1610. The population studied in this community was people of age 40 years and above. This was estimated to be 38% (612) of the population (1610). Among the 612, only 120 (19.6%) met the inclusion criteria, 104 out of 120 turn up, given a response rate of 86.7%.

Comment no 3: I have therefore suggested that based on 2 above, modifications be made or title of article be reconsidered

Response: Article title reconsidered as “Prevalence of cardiovascular risk factors among Adults without obvious cardiovascular disease in rural community in Ekiti state, south west Nigeria”.

Comment no 4: I have made other suggestions on the manuscript, particularly on the methodology which might make the results and conclusion suspect On the whole it is a worthwhile effort and may be a nidus for a broader screening of the rural population (These issues about methodology were mentioned on the manuscript as RF3 and RF4. It concerns inclusion and exclusion criteria)

Responses:

RF1- [Why capital letter]

Topographical error, the word “agriculture” changed to farming during copy edit. Line 4.

RF2- [Why 40yrs. Most population studies including the landmark Akinkugbe/Fed Min of Health used 18yrs and above]

Study has shown that CVD now causes most deaths in all developing regions and it is the leading cause of deaths in those older than 45 years occurring in Sub-Saharan Africa\(^3\). In line with WHO and the gerontologist classification of age
groups for developing countries into young adults (<40 years), middle aged (40-59 years), and elderly (60 years and above), we therefore decided to study from middle aged and above. Ref- Janice BS, Douglas PZ: Cardiovascular disease in the elderly. Braunwald’s Heart Disease, 7th Ed. Saunders USA. 2005,72:1929-1937.

RF3- [This will reduce your prevalence rate! The other option is to adjust the title of your manuscript to PREVALENCE IN THOSE WITHOUT OBVIOUS CVD]
Title adjusted as stated above (response to comment no 3).

RF4- [But your initial criteria was supposed to exclude those with CVD]
The intending meaning was ”(except those subjects with evidence of end-organ damage that is related to long-standing hypertension which were excluded)”.
However, this has been deleted to avoid confusion. Determination of hypertension had been considered in paragraph 5.

RF5- [capital]
Small letter “t” changed to capital letter “T” in line 8 under results.

RF6- Results are reported in past tense
“are” changed to “were” paragraph 4 line 3.

RF7- Meaning what?
Sentence rephrased, paragraph 5 line 1 and 2.

RF8- Probably, but you did not set out to sample the young adults!
“mainly” changed to “possibly” paragraph 2 line 2

RF9- grammar
“wives” corrected to “wife”

RF10- This is not a Table but an appendix
Table removed (recommended by reviewer 2), already referenced in the methodology- ref 16.
RESPONSE TO REVIEWER’S REPORT

REVIEWER 2 [Michael O. Balogun]

Comment no 1:
Definitions: (I) Dyslipidaemia:- Line 2 should be corrected to read "cut-off"
Points

Response: corrected.

(ii) Waist circumference: the values should be correctly stated (e.g. >102cm)

Response: Corrected.

Comment no 2:
Data collection: Fifth paragraph starting with "Blood pressure.." should be
re-written with attention paid to the grammatical construction of the sentences.

Response: Corrected.

Comment no 3:
Results: The style of writing could be improved. Sentences should be made
clearer and broken down into smaller ones e.g. the sentence starting with "No
significant dyslipidaemia was observed among..."
These comments are relevant to all the aspects of the manuscript including the
discussion section. Typographical errors should be corrected.

Response: Correction done. The entire manuscript copy edited.

Comment no 4:
Inconsistencies in the list of references should be corrected.

Response: Correction made and formatted in line with journal requirement.

Comment no 5:
I believe there are too many tables for this kind of work and should be
reduced. Table 1 is not necessary and table 4 should be compressed.
Response: Table 1 removed and table 4 compressed.

Comment no 6:

Authors’ contribution: Under OOO and BOA should be written as "involved in the writing of the manuscript"

Response: correction done.

Comment no 7: DISCRETIONARY REVISIONS

Response: applied.