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Reviewer’s report:

- Minor Essential Revisions

1. The second part of the study aims referring to “Associations between risk factors were examined” need to be clarified. The association is usually studied between dependent and independent variable, please clarify this point.

2. STEPwise surveillance is designed to provide data at the country level, it was not clear from the methodology whether the STEPwise survey conducted in Vietnam was restricted to the eight urban and eight rural communes mentioned or the sample taken for this study was a sub-sample from the national study. This part need to be explained in more details.

3. The calculated sample size for the survey was not mentioned in the methodology but it was mentioned later in the results part. Please move this information to the methodology section.

4. More information is need about how the questionnaire was filled, and the staff involved in data collection and taking measurements. These points were mentioned in the last paragraph of the discussion. I think its more appropriate to mention them in the methodology section.

5. In the first paragraph of the results, the last sentence was correct for men but not for women.

6. The numbers presented in the second paragraph in the results reading table 2 were not found in the table nor could be derived from it.

7. In the discussion the author mentioned that the residents of Mekong Delta have distinctively different lifestyle. This needs to be explained further either by providing reference documenting these differences or by listing the differences in the discussion. I would suggest that the author provide some background information about the study region and compare it to the general population in Vietnam.

8. The second paragraph of the discussion is just a repetition of the results. I would suggest that the author put more analytical import in it or remove it. This applies to different parts of the discussion.

9. References. Access date for online references should be added.

10. The information presented in figure 1 and 2 can be presented in one figure showing the relation between hypertension and body mass index adjusting for
age. Otherwise, the author need to present the results adjusted for age in the text.

11. Tables 2 and 3 columns were labeled % + 95CI while the numbers presented were either standard deviation or standard error. Needs proper labeling

12. Table 2. There are % signs next to alcohol consumption results for women. The table needs editing and clarification as mentioned earlier.

- Discretionary Revisions

1. In the abstract, the sign of the overweight definition is in the opposite direction and need to be corrected to less than rather than more than.

2. In the abstract the author referred to fasting blood glucose as FBG but in the text, the author referred to it as BG, no consistency in using abbreviations.

3. In Table 1, it is preferable to list the total number of participating men and women.

4. In Table 1 footnote, the last note is not clear.
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