Reviewer's report

**Title:** Major inducing factors of hypertensive complications and the interventions required to reduce their prevalence: an epidemiological study of hypertension in a rural population in China

**Version:** 2  **Date:** 13 December 2010

**Reviewer:** Renee Van Stavern

**Reviewer's report:**

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? yes
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? yes
3. Are the data sound? yes
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? yes
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? The abstract conclusion is a better summary of the work than the conclusion in the body of the text. The conclusion paragraph makes statements about the NRCMS that are not supported by the study, and this paragraph should be modified.
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