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Author’s response to reviews:

Reviewers’ comments were uploaded as a supplementary file

Reviewer 1

1 A thorough proofread of the manuscript is still required as there are several grammatical errors.
A thorough proofreading has been done

2 Correlation coefficients in the abstract need p values.
   This has now been included. P 3; line 45, 51, 52-53

3 It is still unclear in the introduction how the agreement between the FFQ and 24 hour recall in terms of nutrient intakes informs research into cardiovascular risk factors. This should be explicit. For example in lines 72-73, the authors state that diet plays a role in development and prevention of CVD. How does diet play this role, can the authors provide a link between CVD and the nutrient intake assessment that they describe in the validation study?

The link between CVD and nutrients is included in the introduction and we have incorporated this issue in the discussion during previous revision. P 5, 7; line 74-80, 110-112
4 Lines 67-69 state that CVD prevalence could be between <1 - 77%. This is a very wide range and doesn't really help the reader to understand the public health problem in Bangladesh. Was there any meta-analysis in the systematic review?

Thank you for this suggestion. It is now modified. P 5; line 67-72

5 Line 103, please say something about the arsenic study. What were the study objectives, how many participants and where was it conducted.

Included in the text. P 7; line 113-116

Reviewer 2

6 Abstract: please add the following information: Participants were asked to recall their frequency of consumption over the preceding three months.

It has now been included. P 3; line 39-40

7 L 69: "A recent systematic review of prevalence studies in Bangladesh indicates that CVD prevalence could vary from less than 1% to 77.7%": precise "according to the type of CVD studied".

Thank you for this suggestion. It has been now modified. P 5; line 67-72

8 L 75: "Different methods have been designed to assess dietary patterns". I suggest to use "diet" instead of "dietary patterns"

We now use diet instead of dietary patterns. P 5; line 82

9 L 90-92: please add references.

Reference has been added. P 6; line 97-100

10 L103: I suggest "adapted" instead of "adopted.

Thank you. It has been replaced to adapted. P 7; line 114

11 L110: Please precise "against three 24-hour recalls"

Thanks, we clarified it as suggested. Page 7; line 121-122

12 L115: "However, samples of the both studies were different »; can be deleted.

This was the suggestion of another reviewer during previous revision. However, we have modified this line. Page 7; line 128
13 L 118: suggestion: "and pregnant women, those who had intellectual disability or any chronic medical conditions which require dietary restriction were excluded".

Modified as per suggestion. Page 7, 8; line 116-118, 132-136, 138-142, 152-153,

14 I think the manuscript still requires a thorough proof read. Here are examples of statements I suggest to rephrase: L104-106;L120-123;L126-130;L140-141.

Now It has been proofread. Page 7-8; line 131-132

15 L368-379. I suggest: We found fair to moderate agreement for ranking energy, macro and micronutrients into quartiles indicating the FFQ is good for studying relationships with nutrients intakes.

Modified as per suggestion. Page 18; line 379-381

16 L490-491: the limit is that data on dietary supplement was not collected (instead of analyzed).

We have now changed the word to collected Page 23; line 506

17 L491: add "also". Also, although our reference for recall period.

Added. Page 23; line 506

18 I think the differences observed between rural and urban residents are still not sufficiently discussed in the discussion section. However hypotheses on gender and literacy are raised in the responses to reviewers. Please add statements about it in the discussion section.

This is added in the discussion Page 22; line 472-473