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Reviewer's report:

General
This is an interesting study comparing the prevalence of geometrical abnormalities in native Nigerian hypertensives. The major strengths of the manuscript are the large number of subject included in the analysis and the echocardiographic methodology. Although other studies have previous looked at this topic, the manuscript is of interest. Nevertheless the authors should revise in part their manuscript and their reference list to improve the quality of their work.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

NONE

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------

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) The authors should comment on two manuscripts published last year

   de Simone G, Devereux RB et al. Am J Hypertens. 2005 Oct;18(10):1288-93 and

   that have prognostically compared different normalization for LV hypertrophy.

2) Page 7 line 8. This is wrong. In the presence of increased LV mass and increased RWT the geometric abnormality is defined Concentric hypertrophy, please correct.

3) Please include reference:

4) It should be clarified in the discussion that partition values are derived from reference normal individuals, and therefore are strongly population dependent. It should also be noted that different methods of indexation lead to different results mainly because looking at LV mass from different points of view. For example indexation for BSA offsets the independent impact of obesity while indexation for height (especially when indexed by 2.7) is useful in the definition of "genetically determined" LV mass. It is therefore expected to have different prevalences using different indexations. It could be of great interest for the authors to define which methods is more reliable in their specific population, through future prospective studies.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No

Declaration of competing interests:

'I declare that I have no competing interests'