Reviewer’s report

Title: The prevalence of hyperuricemia in China: a meta-analysis

Version: 1 Date: 29 June 2011

Reviewer: Robin Leonard

Reviewer’s report:


The authors are to be commended for their recognition of the data gaps concerning the prevalence of a condition related to modifiable risk factors in chronic disease. Their approach to calculating the general prevalence of hyperuricemia on mainland China is appropriate. However, there are issues that need to be addressed.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. More detail should be provided in the methods concerning the decision criteria for including specific data sets and the tabulation of the quality decisions made by the three reviewers, along with any differences noted.

2. The Methods section for data analysis states that a published method for meta-analysis was used, but no reference is cited. The section contains no justification for using random effects models, and no qualifications for the use of the X2 statistic were provided. A short description of the I2 statistic should be given.

3. Results should be presented on the degree of heterogeneity in the study-specific estimates of prevalence.

4. While the tables in the supplemental material are informative, the major results should also be included in the Results section narrative.

5. The Conclusions are vague and much too brief. This section offers no indication that the data analysis and prevalence estimates provide a solid foundation for population prevalence estimation as a step toward dealing with the growing issue of chronic disease increase. I think this is what they are trying to say, but it needs to be specifically described.

Minor Essential Revisions

1. Table 5. Footnote should be changed to read "Most Subjects..." rather than "Most Objects..."

2. Much of the literature on other population prevalence estimates that is in the discussion section should be part of the introduction, leaving the discussion section to include comparisons in methods and findings with the study presented in this manuscript, and the implications for further research.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.

Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests.