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I still have three major concerns:
1. The authors stated that:

"We retrieved the full-text for the selected studies either via the Internet or from the author
directly; however, full text could not be obtained for 5 studies. The prevalence data for these

studies was extracted from the abstract

How did they evaluate quality if they do not have the full paper? Only using the abstract?"

2. The authors inform that they only included papers published between 1995 and 2010:

To this end, we compiled the results of all research studies on CVD and T2DM, published in

national and international journals, between 1995 and 2010.

Did the authors looking for unpublished papers? Papers with negative results are less published and when published, in journals with a lesser impact factor. What the authors did to avoid “publication bias”?

3. The authors used the results to discuss temporal trends of hypertension and diabetes prevalence in Bangladesh in the results and discussion sections.

The pooled HTN prevalence within each 5-year time period

204 was: 1995-2000 = 11.0% (95%CI: 9.4% - 12.6%), 2001-2005=12.8% (95%CI: 7.3% - 18.3%),
205 and 2006-2010=15.3% (95%CI: 13.2% - 17.5%);

In Figure 4 part A, the authors presented data according to the prevalence in three time intervals. The confidence intervals showed superposition of the first period with the second and of the second with the third. Only the first period is different from the third. However, the authors included studies with poor, moderate and high quality in the analysis what compromises the final result. What happen to figure 4A if the authors analyse according to quality level?
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