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Reviewer's report:

This study provides blood pressure prevalence for the oldest old in China and would therefore provide a useful contribution to existing literature.

There have been significant improvements since the previous version of the manuscript. However, there remain some major issues.

There remain potential sources of bias that are essential to convey to the reader clearly to aid interpretation.

In particular, potential selection bias due to the requirement for completeness of BP/hypertension recording and the combination category of BP recording and patient reporting without medication awareness or corroboration from medical notes. It is noted that the missing data is now numerically summarised in the appendix. However, the nature of missingness and what approach was taken to overcome missing data are not addressed. Was it clear from the protocol who might not have BP recorded? Are these the most frail potentially?

The language is much improved, however refinements are still required to aid clarity and interpretation. I list some of the suggested changes below, along with some other points.

P.2. line 9

Backgrounds change to Background

P2. Line 18

Be more precise as "oldest old" is not a clearly defined term and can vary. Needs age clarifier here.

P2 line 24

There is a described decrease in systolic BP rather than increase.
I would also suggest including more detail on those diagnosed with hypertension, given the presented reduction in SBP over time. I am unclear how there can be a reduction in SBP over time, with increased isolated systolic hypertension and an increase in overall hypertension.

P3 line 7
Backgrounds change to Background

P3 line 13
"coronary heart disease and stroke risks"

P3 line 13
"However, there were age differences among the prevalence of hypertension and also its risk for related diseases."

I don't understand what this means.

P4

Please reference "definitions".

P5 line 23
"The mean SBP level was 148.4±24.4 mmHg in 1998 wave for 8694 participants and there was significant difference and fluctuations over the past 16 years for SBP levels. A significant decrease was seen along with age groups (p<0.05)."

This needs refining for clarity. The reader has to guess the meaning from the results rather than being able to be guided by the text.

Conclusions

"The results also provided evidence about the trends of prevalence of hypertension in China, which indicated that hypertension prevention was still a long and arduous task since the prevalence was high. Additionally, it suggested that specific people should be targeted for enhanced hypertension screening and management to reduce related cardiovascular disease burden."

I would suggest rewording the "long and arduous task"
The last sentence is an over-interpretation of results, given that cardiovascular outcomes are beyond the scope of this study. I would suggest removing this sentence "Additionally…burden" 

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

Yes

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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