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Reviewer's report:

I thank you the authors for their responses to my comments.

I still have some minor comments.

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

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".

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

L 90-92: please add references

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

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

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

L 118: suggestion: "and pregnant women, those who had intellectual disability or any chronic medical conditions which require dietary restriction were excluded".

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

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.

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

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