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Reviewer's report:

General comments:
This is an interesting descriptive research focus on distributions of cardiovascular disease risk factors conducted by Nepal where presumably public health policy is concerned. As this study is a descriptive study used a cross-sectional design, it is however not possible to make conclusion whether trend of cardiovascular disease risk factors are increasing or not in this area. The major strength of the study is the inclusion of minority people in Nepal (extremely hilly, remote, rural community, basic facilities are not exist) and that has high value for making future policies in public health perspective. However, the manuscript need for few changes. The methods and the statistical analysis seems to be sound in general, but the intension behind is not clearly explained, implication (overall usefulness), and future suggestion (e.g. which modifiable factor is needed for control) is missing. In the following, the areas needing more coverage are listed.

Major Compulsory Revisions

#1. Table 3 is not a description of cardiovascular disease risk factors, but association between hypertension and cardiovascular disease risk factors. It is not correspond with the main study purpose.
Also this study focused on 6 cardiovascular risk factors (smoking, alcohol consumption, insufficient fruit and vegetable intake, insufficient activity, overweight and BMI, hypertension), it is better to show results of insufficient fruit and vegetable intake, and insufficient activity. And hypertension is affected by sex, therefore multivariate model should add up the sex and the results should be on the table 3.

#2. Need more neat and efficient sentence for study purpose. (Only for descriptive cardiovascular disease risk factors or association between hypertension and cardiovascular disease risk factors)

#3. If you want to keep hypertension as a dependent variable (outcome), it is better to describe thoroughly about the blood pressure measurement. Did they considered hypertension medication? When (time) does the blood pressure measured? Are they fasting state? Are they considering tea, coffee, and smoking? Are they took the rest at least 5 min before taking blood pressure?

Minor Essential Revisions
#1. Need for change commonly used term. Since most readers are in the field of the cardiology, it is better to use as ‘cardiovascular disease risk factors (Modifiable risk factors, Non-Modifiable risk factors)’ instead of ‘Cardiovascular health risk behaviors’. It may requires change the title term also.

#2. Since this is not a national representative sample, and most international readers not aware of Nepal’s current cardiovascular health status, it is better to give us precisely how different the study area is comparing to the other Nepal area and why did you select this specific area and population in the introduction part. And it is better to connect the result and making important point at the discussion part why this is important although it is just one area (e.g. health inequality).

#3. This study evaluated people with high risk. Do you think population-wide comprehensive intervention is required? Isn’t it be better to use high risk approach?

#4. At the abstract part abbreviation VDC is not clear.

#5. Why 2 statistical packages were used in the analysis? Usually 1 packages used for one paper except there is a very specific reason.

#6. Although insufficient fruit and vegetable intake are unhealthy behavior but considering as conservative cardiovascular risk factors is controversial. And the index is not quite standard yet (quantity, ethnicity). Could you provide related article rather than WHO report?

#7. This study requires to maintain record for data, why only take a verbal agreement?

#8. It is better to mention clearly about the implication (overall usefulness of the study), and future suggestion (e.g. which modifiable factor need for control).
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