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Reviewer's report:

The MS: ASSOCIATION BETWEEN -T786C NOS3 POLYMORPHISM AND RESISTANT HYPERTENSION: A PROSPECTIVE COHORT STUDY is a well-written manuscript with good design of the study.

1. The purpose of the study was to determine a possible association between the -786T>C and G894T (Glu298Asp) polymorphisms of the NOS3 gene and resistant hypertension.

The question posed by the authors well defined in the main text of the MS, but not in the Abstract section. My first suggestion is to define the aim in the abstract section.

2. Methods are appropriate and well described.

3. Data are sound.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?

I would suggest adding the cumulative number in Tables 1 and 2 in rows and columns (for example: Table 1, GG genotype 18 + 87 = 105 – add number 105 in column, etc.)

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?

Discussion is well balanced and adequately supported by the data.

My suggestion is to add the power of the study and comment the power of the study with regard to the number of cases with resistant hypertension.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?

The limitation of the study might be the number of cases with resistant hypertension. My suggestion is to calculate the power of the study and comment the power of the study with regard to the number of cases with resistant hypertension.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?

To my knowledge used the authors crucial published genetic MS with regard to
eNOS3. There is, however, one report about the Glu298Asp SNP of the eNOS synthase gene that was associated with drug-resistant hypertension from another EU county (Chech republic) that could be mentioned (Jáchymová M, Horký K, Bultas J, Kozich V, Jindra A, Peleska J, Martásek P, Biochem Biophys Res Commun, 2001).

The structure and information in the abstract section is clear, adequate, and conclusion can be derived from the results of the study. Introduction, methods, results and discussion are well written. The work is presented in good English and in order with writing prescriptions.

Second comment:
The authors should add the power of the study
Otherwise, no problems are observed regarding the manuscript.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable
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