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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses one or several testable research questions? (Brief or other article types: is there a clear objective?)

Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

No - there are minor issues

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with sufficient technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

No - there are minor issues

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?

Yes - appropriate statistical analyses have been used in the study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

No - there are minor issues

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? If not, can further revisions be made to make the work technically sound?

Probably - with minor revisions
GENERAL COMMENTS: PATIENT, CLINICIAN AND LOGISTIC BARRIERS TO BLOOD PRESSURE CONTROL AMONG ADULT HYPERTENSIVES IN RURAL DISTRICT HOSPITALS IN RWANDA: A CROSS-SECTIONAL STUDY

Thanks for the opportunity to re-review this manuscript.

1. There is much improvement in the manuscript compared with previous submission.

2. Authors have admitted the need to modify the title of the study to reflect the content of the manuscript as suggested by this reviewer. The title is now appropriate.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

STUDY DESIGN AND DEFINITION OF HYPERTENSION AND BP CONTROL IN TEENAGED AGE 15, 16 AND 17 YEARS

3. Study design is confusing:

   In the abstract section the use of words 'cross-sectional' 'prospective' are confusing! Was the study a cross-sectional or prospective study? The use of word 'prospective' whether for descriptive convenience or thematic elaboration should be reviewed throughout the manuscript.

Please read the title of the study:

PATIENT, CLINICIAN AND LOGISTIC BARRIERS TO BLOOD PRESSURE CONTROL AMONG ADULT HYPERTENSIVES IN RURAL DISTRICT HOSPITALS IN RWANDA: A CROSS-SECTIONAL STUDY

Read also abstract:

   .........Cross-sectional, multifactorial, observational study conducted at four rural Rwandan district hospitals, examining patient, clinician and logistic factors............

   ......... Blood pressure measurements and other clinical data were collected prospectively during the study visit and used to determine blood pressure control, according to goals......................

Methods

1. Re-cast this sentence

   Please read.....The medical record was reviewed for last prescribed medication, current BP, height and weight; the current antihypertensive prescription was sought directly from the patient............

2. Previous comment on:
a. Inclusion criteria:
- Provide clear definition of adults based on JNC 8 criteria you used in defining BP control. [THIS IS IMPORTANT FOR CLINICAL AND EPIDEMIOLOGICAL PURPOSES AS REGARDS BIOLOGICAL OR CHRONOLOGICAL AGE FOR DIAGNOSIS AND TREATMENT OF HYPERTENSION]
- How did you diagnosed hypertension in 16 and 17-year-old patients you included in the study? [Authors wrote that they used JNC 8 criteria]
- How did you define BP control in 16 and 17-year-old patients you included in the study? [Authors wrote that they used JNC 8 criteria]

PLEASE READ….. Patients aged greater than 15 years, with known hypertension that was managed in an outpatient setting………………

RESULTS SECTIONS: AUTHORS ARE YET TO PROVIDE APPROPRIATE RESPONSES FOR MY COMMENTS [SEE PREVIOUS COMMENTS]

i. Remove reference citation from the results section [Please delete reference 8]. IT IS INAPPROPRIATE FOR AUTHORS TO USE THE SAME BP CUT OFF POINTS BASED ON THE REFERENCE 8 TO DEFINE BP CONTROL IN TEENAGED AGED 16 AND 17 YEARS; OTHER SPECIAL HIGH RISK PATIENTS.

PLEASE READ THIS………………Only 26 (29%) had achieved the goal blood pressure.8

HERE IS REFERENCE 8

ii. Define adult by JNC 8 criterion?

STUDY PROCEDURE AND CRITERIA
1. How did you define BP control for the teenaged hypertensives aged 15, 16, and 17 years USING JNC 8? [MISCLASSIFICATION]
2. 3. How did you define BP control for the special population group of hypertensive such as diabetic hypertensives, etc USING JNC 8? [MISCLASSIFICATION]

Thank you

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No
Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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