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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions:

1) Methods, paragraph 2: The study population in this study consists of outpatients at a hypertension / dyslipidaemia clinic at a university teaching hospital. Since the vast majority of hypertensive patients are managed and monitored in the primary care sector, it may be that this group of patients are being monitored at a hospital clinic due to their blood pressure being too difficult to control in the community. There were also a large proportion of patients in the study (65%) who had had a high BP for more than five years. This might explain why the proportion of adequately controlled patients was low in this study. The authors need to address this point before publication can be considered.

2) Discussion, paragraph 1: The authors need to expand upon the possible reasons for the low success in adequate hypertensive control in their patient population, given that the other cited studies demonstrated much greater success in achieving adequate blood pressure control.

3) Discussion, paragraph 2: The authors need to expand upon why there was no statistically significant difference in BP control between obese and non-obese individuals, and between males and females, in their study, given that these might be important factors in resistant hypertension.

Minor Essential Revisions:

1) Background, paragraph 1: Citation for JNC 7 guidelines needs to be given and included in the References.

2) Background, paragraph 2: First sentence duplicates information in Methods; can be removed.

3) Methods, paragraph 2: It is unclear from the sentence, ‘Patients with both compelling indications and special indications were classified into the former group’ as to which group they are classified in; this section needs to be rewritten to clarify this.

4) Methods, paragraph 2: The time period for data collection has not been specified [was mentioned in the Abstract]; needs to be included here.

5) Methods, paragraph 4: Last phrase beginning ‘and a P-value of less than....’ is superfluous and can be removed.

6) Results, paragraph 1: Last sentence (beginning ‘It should be noted that the
first months....’) is discussion and should be moved to a more appropriate place in the Discussion section.

Discretionary Revisions:

1) Methods: The authors may wish to consider combining Tables 2 and 4 for clarity and ease of comparison.

2) Discussion, paragraph 1: The authors imply that the main reason for failure to adequately control BP in those with DM and CKD is due to prescribers not adequately following the JNC 7 guidelines. Whilst this is an acceptable interpretation, the authors may wish to consider other possible reasons for this, given that this is a finding common to almost all the cited studies in this paragraph.

3) Discussion, paragraph 6: The authors may wish to consider including the collected data regarding medication adherence, since that would obviously have a huge bearing on the proportion of patients with adequate hypertensive control.

Minor issues not for publication:

1) There are many grammatical and typographical mistakes throughout the paper, which are too numerous to list here. The authors may wish to consider having their article professionally edited to eliminate these from the submitted version prior to publication.

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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