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Reviewer's report:

Minor essential revisions
Last sentence of results - it is difficult to relate 4% and 5% further measures of SHT to table 2. Can this be done more clearly.

SHT is still not defined in Fig 1 or its legend.

Discussion
Absence of lipids is likely to be due to failure to measure lipids and is a behaviour issue which probably goes along with failure to follow up on BPs adequately. This could be pointed out and wherever lipids are mentioned the wording could be altered.

A limitation is that Blood pressure control is considered as a categorical variable. thus achieving 141/91 after initially having SHT is considered a failure while 140/90 is a success. In practice both are equally good. Further a major improvement to near normotensive is still of some use. These points should be discussed briefly. That does not detract from the main thrust of this paper as long as this point is made the rest is acceptable.
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