

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/jxym-21-29>

Reviewer A

Title

Comment 1: Title is quite okay.

Reply 1: Thank you.

Abstract

Comment 2: In the background, no hint was given about the nature/type of risk factors. The data was collected purposively. It was not elaborated what criteria were taken to select a participant to be included in the study. In the result, section comparison was made across gender only; but no attempt was made to examine the result with other studies conducted in our vicinity or elsewhere. At the end of the discussion, it was stated that the “majority of the university students had at least one, more than half had two or more and 15.5% had three or more NCD risk factors”. This line makes some confusion. What percentage makes “majority” and what percentage makes “more than half” were not mentioned exactly. It was stated that about 11.3% of students smoked cigarettes which is far below than national prevalence. What are the standard limits of risk factors prevalence and how the current participants outplayed them is not clear.

Reply 2: Thank you for the comments.

- The nature/type of risk factors are mentioned (page number:03, line number:43)
- Elaborated the criteria were taken to select a participant to be included in the study (page number:03, line number:47-50)

Introduction

Comment 3: All necessary background information is adequately furnished.

Reply 3: Thank you.

Methods

Comment 4: Quite brilliantly presented. No ambiguity is noted. Concise and clear.

Reply 4: Thanks for the comment.

Result

Comment 5: Okay. Fulfilled the objectives. Nicely presented both in text in figure and table.

Reply 5: Thanks for the compliments.

Discussion

Comment 6: The discussion is quite okay and meet the international standard. Weakness and strength of the study is rightly described.

Reply 6: Thank you.

References

Comment 7: References are cited correctly.

Reply 7: Thanks for the comment.

Overall comment

Comment 8: The whole article is up to the standard and can be published without any major correction. Only in abstract some modification/inclusion of data should be made.

Reply 8: Thank you for the overall comments.

Reviewer B

General comments

In this present study, Nowsheen et al. aimed at assessing the NCD risk factors among postgraduate students residing in the capital city Dhaka of Bangladesh using a cross-sectional study design and online social media platform. Their study title, rationale, objectives, and methods look clear, consistent and appropriate. And, they reported to found a high proportion of NCD risk factors among the educated younger group of the country. However, there are few minor observations which are indicated in the following specific comments.

Specific comments

Abstract

Comment 1: Page 4 lines 50-51, 'fruit or vegetable'? Why not 'fruit and vegetables' together? Similar in the lines 114, 145, 149, 175, 176, and 221.

Reply 1: Changed as suggested.

Introduction

Comment 2: Page 5 lines 66-67, full forms of CVDs, COPD and LMICs should be first before abbreviated use.

Reply 2: Corrected as suggested.

Comment 3: Page 5 line 66, is stroke not included in the CVD group?

Reply 3: Yes. Changed as suggested.

Comment 4: Page 5 line 77, please check grammar.

Reply 4: Checked and corrected.

Methods:

Comment 5: Page 5 line 81, 'study design and settings' sound better.

Reply 5: Changed as suggested.

Comment 6: Page 6 line 96, 'registered office'?

Reply 6: Corrected.

Results:

Comment 7: Page 8 line 150, check grammar.

Reply 7: Checked and corrected as appropriate.

Comment 8: Page 8 line 152, check grammar.

Reply 8: Checked and corrected as appropriate.

Comment 9: Page 8 line 155, how the participants were categorized with 'low physically active'? Need to describe in the Methods section.

Reply 9: We have described briefly (page number:06-07, line number:125-127)