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Author’s response to reviews:

Editor-in-Chief,
BMC Public Health
5 May 2017

Dear Editor,

As instructed, we have addressed all the comments of reviewer 1 (Naohiro Yonemoto). All inputs are clearly marked in track change in the revised manuscript for ease of reference. The point-by-point changes made to the manuscript as well as responses to the comments of the reviewer are as follows:
1. In abstract, you should write 95% CI of all estimates, not only p-value on results.

   The 95% CI were included as suggested (Line 37-41)

2. In abstract, extents of the exposure were not clear. You should clearly write the extents as BMI per 1 increase

   Based on the WHO STEPwise approach methodology, BMI is classified as lean (<18.5 kg/m2), normal (18.5-24.9 kg/m2), overweight (25.0-29.9 kg/m2) and obese (30+ kg/m2). The extent of association of BMI increase with hypertension was therefore analyzed using this classification (see table 3). The analysis shows an increase in adjusted odds ratio from 1.74 for normal BMI to 3.93 for obese BMI (p=0.000). We included this in the abstract section (line 41 to 43). This was already reflected in the results section (line 240 to 242)

3. In abstract and conclusion, "effective prevention and ...." on the conclusion was not based on your study findings. You should only write them from the findings, therefore should revise them. The strategy should be planned after you synthesize all related evidence, not only this findings.

   The conclusions in the abstract and conclusion in the main manuscript were revised as recommended (Line 42-45 and line 302-312)

4. In results and tables, you should order information of the estimates as AOR X.XX, 95%CI X.XX to X.XX, p=0.000X.

   The information of the estimates was reordered (Line 229 to 238 and table 3: line 611)

5. In study limitations, discussion, L336, "This inference is also..." was not appropriate and delete it, because this section was "limitations".

   This was deleted. Line 288

6. As you write on conclusion, this study cannot analyze some risk factors as psychosocial stress. I hope this study had a limitation as secondary analysis. You should add them.
We added a third limitation about the inability to analyze other risks factors of hypertension as suggested. Line 292 to 294

7. In conclusion, L355, the first sentence should be deleted, because this was not a study finding

The first sentence in the conclusion section was deleted. Line 298 to 299

We reviewed the manuscript again to ensure that it adheres to your journal’s style, editorial policies and requirements and checked to ensure that the declaration section with all mandatory sub-sections was also included. In addition, we also proof read and made minor editorial changes. We are therefore resubmitting the manuscript for your kind consideration. We are available to clarify the responses above and any other issues in the revised manuscript.

We look forward to your favorable consideration of the manuscript for publication and hearing from you at your earliest convenience.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Marie-Rosette Nahimana