



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012 BJMMR 2685
Title of the Manuscript:	Knowledge of hypertension and other risk factors for heart disease among Yoruba Rural Southwestern Nigerian Population

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The difficulty about absence of local terminologies for diseases, risk factors, complications is that by the time we use 'lengthy descriptions' to explain them, we give away the very knowledge we are seeking to investigate from respondents. 2. The definitions for <i>hypertension</i> should be included in the text under Methods as earlier suggested. Although '<i>good knowledge</i>' forms the basis for Tables 2 and 5, it is not defined in the text in line with previous recommendations. 3. I am surprised that for a paper which assesses knowledge, the authors do not wish to report on the number of risk factors known by group 4. The time frame of 1 year in Table 3 should be included in the Table heading. The time frame is missing in lines 396, 401 and 407 in the Table. Within text, the one year time frame should be specified in lines 65-66, 158, 226-227 and 231. Otherwise, it gives an impression of their lifetime experience before the study. 5. The reason for not providing a total column combining the categories of hypertension is untenable, since Table 3 correctly provides the total column. Such categorizations are usually done for comparisons between groups. In that case, column percentages are preferred in tables 1 and 3. 6. The authors neglect to report on the type of regression analysis done within the text or in the table. The interpretation in lines 171-174 (and in the abstract) is incorrect. In both cases, they claim the "information is clear enough". The confidence intervals are related to the sample size. The odds ratios should be interpreted as '<i>as likely as</i>' and <u>not</u> '<i>more than</i>'. For example, "respondents who had a tertiary level of education were 3.1 times as likely as those with lower level or no education ..., after adjusting for socio-demographic and other variables". It should be acknowledged that 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It was only in exceptional cases that this was done. We want to reiterate the fact that local terminologies are available. 2. Hypertension was defined as blood pressure $\geq 140/90$ mmHg or on treatment for hypertension. 3. We appreciate the reviewer's concern about this but we strongly believe that since this study is in the free-living population and not in hypertensive patients where such information might be critical, what we required has been adequately captured. 4. The use of health facilities captured subjects who had never done the investigation in the past and those who had it in the last one year at the time of the study. Therefore, the time frame of one year cannot be included in the study. 5. The thrust of our study and analysis is still the overall population. The reviewer's comment on this is not clear to us. 6. This has been corrected in the abstract and the write-up.



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

<p>except for educational level, the differences were not statistically significant</p> <p>7. The authors cite a high response rate as the main strength of the study but they do not quantify this or give reasons for refusal among participants. Non-participants may have a different level of knowledge of hypertension and risk factors from participants.</p> <p>8. Remove the months included in the newly inserted references 9-12 in the bibliography</p> <p>9. Line 219: change ‘<i>this proportion</i>’ to ‘<i>these proportions</i>’</p> <p>10. Line 98 insert: “Many <i>hypertensives</i> ...”</p> <p>11. Typo in discussion: ... this calls for <i>increased</i> identification ...</p>	<p>8. Corrected</p> <p>9. Corrected</p> <p>10. Corrected</p> <p>11. Corrected</p>
--	---