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**Reviewer's report:**

Farag et al. have improved their manuscript considerably. I still have a few thoughts.

**Major Compulsory Revisions**

1. The introduction is shorter but still not focused. I would suggest summarizing the description of CVD in a sentence or two and briefly mentioning CKD and then more clearly justifying the study here (in terms of the population at risk and the developing nation angle).

2. It is still unclear how participants were sampled. Were they consecutive among those showing up at the camp? And if so, how did they know about the camp (advertising?)? Or were they invited by phone or mail and if so was it a random sample? Simply knowing they were examined at camps doesn't give enough information about sampling to assess the generalizability.

3. I still think the statement about salt consumption is overstepping. Perhaps it could read something like "..may be cost-effective solutions" rather than "..are likely to be the most cost-effective solutions" since the authors do not present salt consumption data and the risk associated with salt in this population is unknown (in terms of these data, anyway).

**Minor Essential Revisions**

1. Add the "5 minutes apart" information to the description of blood pressure measurement. Since this is the variable of interest the definition should be very specific.

2. The main results are buried in the text. I would suggest adding a table or figure (or maybe adding a top "total" row to Table 2) to emphasize these further.

**Discretionary Revisions**

1. Remove the first reference to Table 3. It's unnecessary and the tables are not called out in order.

2. In Table 3, the chi-square value is unnecessary. As noted before, it is preferable not to use SAS output directly but to typeset tables for readability/interpretability.

3. What is a "random" blood sample? Non-fasting? If so I'd change the wording
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