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Reviewer's report:

General comments

1) The quality of English should be improved. Please ask highly qualified native speaking English with expertise in Medicine/Public Health to help for this task. You can also ask the help of professional writers.

2) All sentences should not be started by a numeric terms.

3) Please consider revising the reporting of the study with STROBE guidelines for cross sectional studies.

Major comments

1) I suggest to the authors to use the term "(Un)diagnosed hypertension" instead of "(Un)recognized hypertension". Undiagnosed hypertension well reflect and clearly state the difference with diagnosed hypertension.

2) Describe the design of the study. Specify if this is a cross-sectional study.

3) Specify if a consecutive sampling was used.

4) Authors stated that "biological measures" were collected. Which biological measures? What types (blood sample?)? For measuring what?

5) "few individuals approached declined to participate". The exact number should be given.

6) "Based on conversation with community leaders to understand the meaning of income levels in the context of the community". Do any preliminary PUBLISHED data exist to support this statement?
7) Statistical analysis. It is not clear how frequencies can help to describe continuous data.

8) "two adjusted multiple logistic regression models". It would be better to write: "We performed two multiple variable logistic regression analysis. The first model…”

9) "Secondly, proportions and confidence intervals for each of the three outcomes of interest (>=130/80mmHg cut-point, >=140/90mmHg cut-point and unrecognized hypertension) were compared using chi2 tests for categories of demographic factors." This sentence should be rewritten. The message is confusing.

10) The term "predictors" should be avoided since the authors performed a cross sectional study.

11) Results should include the response rate.

12) Report the mean age with standard deviation.

13) Report the median family dependents.

14) The term "Approximately" should be avoided when reporting results.

15) When reporting the prevalence in the text, report alongside the number of cases.

16) "Monthly income prevalence of hypertension…". Do you want to write, prevalence of hypertension by monthly income accordingly? Please revise if yes.

17) In the Tables 1, 2, and 3, report in each line the n and %. Actually, only the % were reported.

18) The paragraph describing findings reported in the Table 2 should be shortened. First, text should not repeat data report in the table and should be limited on interpretation. Second, in the Table 2, authors should report the exact value of p value comparing different prevalence instead of giving only the value in the foot of the table. Same comment for Table 3.

19) The Table 4 and 5 should be revised (as below). Please look at the attached file. For these tables, authors should report the n and % for each variable. Authors should also report firstly the crude odd ratio performed through a univariable logistic regression analysis before reporting the multivariable model (in the same table), alongside with p value in each case.
20) Define "CI" in footnote of tables.

Minor comments

21) Add a reference for hypertension diagnosis.

22) "education was dichotomized…". The term "dichotomized" should be only used if the variable can only have two possible responses.

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.

Yes

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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