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Reviewer’s report:

Authors have almost fully addressed my concerns except #3.

3) I disagree with your statistical expert, simply because many investigators have provided the statistical tests of differences between men and women based on the cross-sectional manner. No problem if you would have some rationale to discard such a sensitivity analysis, but current statistic approaches can easily support such kind of analysis if the authors have solid hypothesis.

Furthermore, I would indicate several points to be checked.
- Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)
  1) Abstract: Part 2 seems vague.

2) In relation to the indication by the Reviewer 2, I worry about some colloquial expression. For instance, “Some characteristics of ...” the first sentence of Result is no use; we cannot be able to provide “all” characteristics.

3) Information on Figures 2 and 3 are overlapped. I do not think Figure 3 is comparably important.
- Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
  1) Abstract: the term “greatest” (in Conclusion) is not suitable, since this involves some judgments by the writer; why not just say “highest”?

- Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
  1) Methods: validation papers should be provided for the boso-medicus PC and boso TM-2430 PC. Measurement device of home blood pressure should also be described in detail.

2) Authors used daytime ambulatory blood pressure data throughout the manuscript. No problem, but please clarify it at the start point of the paper. Investigators on blood pressure might be rather confused.

3) Please provide the rationale why “the mean of the 2nd and 3rd readings of triplicate sets is universally recommended” in Discussion. Recommendation should be based on the prognostic significance of the blood pressure information and, to my best of knowledge, no longitudinal cohort study ignored the 1st readings. Whereas, a threshold can be changed according to the distribution of measurement values.
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Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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