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Reviewer's report:

General
This revised manuscript is a much clearer discussion of methodological issues in developing hypertension guidelines. The article will be of interest not only to guideline developers but also those with an interest in hypertension management.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
None
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
It is not clear from the bibliography that the NICE guideline (22) is the NICE guideline.
In competing interests is the reference given (26) the correct one?
Table 1 - the reference numbers are duplicated in some instances and missing in others.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
None

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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