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Reviewer’s report:

General

The authors found that self-reported hypertension among highly educated participants in a cohort study are a relatively valid tool to assess the hypertensive status of participants.

The methodology is basically correct, the findings are of interest, and discussions are generally reasonable.

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

N/A

------------------------------------------
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. Abstract, main results, line 2, and Introduction, 3rd Para, line3
   Although the authors used the term “direct measurement of blood pressure”, this term generally means “invasive intra-arterial measurement of blood pressure”. Please change it to “conventional measurement of blood pressure”.

2. Methods, Questionnaires, lines 4-5 “…..and their most recent BP measurement …..”
   Did the BP measurement include ambulatory blood pressures or blood pressures measured at home? Please clarify if it included only conventional casual (clinic, office, screening) blood pressures or not.

3. Methods, Validation study, line 3, “Based in results from the literature, …..”
   Please insert appropriate reference(s).

4. Methods, Validation study, 4th Para
   Please describe the methods of blood pressure measurements in detail. Did doctors, or nurses measure the blood pressures? For those who took antihypertensive medication, were their blood pressures measured after administration of the antihypertensive drug(s)? Has the device used (Omron M4-I) been enough validated? Refer the validation paper(s) or website http://www.dableducational.org/.

5. Results, 3rd Para and Table1
   Indicate p-values for the differences between (or “among” for the age) subgroups.
6. Discussion, 2nd Para  
Please insert appropriate reference(s) for the EPIC-Murcia cohort.

7. Discussion, 6th line from the end “………… a possible white-coat effect”.  
Please insert appropriate reference(s).

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

It would be of interest if there were substantial differences in the results according to the faculties/departments the participants graduated, for example, medicine, nursing, health science versus others, etc.

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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