

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/jxym-23-8>

Reviewer A		Response
1	I have made several comments for minor changes on a pdf of the manuscript, including checking references for Tanaka et al and some superscripts in the tables	Thank you for your comments and review suggested, we addressed all comments accordingly please see the review comments bellow: page no-3, line no-90, 93, 94; page no-4, line no-100, 101, 121, 122, 127; page no-5, line no-128; page no-6, line no-162, 188; page no-7, line no-203, 205, 207, 214; page no-8, line no-221, 222, 223; table no-2, line no-278
2	Suggest you include mean and odds ratio with 95% Confidence Intervals rather than standard deviations and p values.	Page no-2, line no-50,51, 52, 56
3	I wonder if you could comment on the importance of salination of groundwater as an important source of salt intake in some populations in Bangladesh and whether this is likely to be important in the population in this study.	All of the participants are the residents of Dhaka city. So, they used the supply water which is undergo for aggressive treatment procedures. So, groundwater is not an issue for the study.
4	What was the response proportion?	Page no-5, line no-155
5	I suggest you use "Mean (SD)" rather than using +/-	Table no-1
6	please discuss the limitations of using spot urine instead of the gold standard 24-hour urine collection as an important limitation of the paper	We discussed about the strength of the spot urine in discussion section of the manuscript. And we did not found any potential limitation for it.
7	It would be good to give some examples of what the salty snacks and processed foods are that are commonly consumed in this population.	Page no-7, line no-198, 199

Reviewer B		Response						
1	Reference #2 and #12 are the same. Please delete one of them and number the rest of the references consecutively in the order.	Line no-101						
2	<p>These numbers do not match with Table 1.</p> <p>187 while one-third (33.3%) had no formal schooling. Most of the male participants</p> <p>188 (56.7%) were manual labourers. In contrast, most female participants (80%) were</p> <p>189 homemakers. When asked about their food habit, 53.3% of all participants</p> <p>190 reported always adding extra salt to food, while 34.8% claimed to have never been</p>	Revised accordingly						
3	<p>Please indicate which unit is correct.</p> <p>195 The estimated mean dietary salt intake was 8.9 (2.0) g/day. Men, on average, had</p> <p>196 slightly lower consumption of salt intake at 8.8 (1.6) g/day than women, 9.0 (2.3</p> <p>197 g/day. However, this difference was not statistically significant⁽¹⁸⁾. Similarly, there</p> <p>198 were slight between groups of respondents concerning age, education, occupation,</p> <p>199 consumption of added salt, and processed food (Table 2). ↵</p> <p>Table 2: Estimated 24-hour (mg/day) salt intake among Kallyanpur slum study population according to demographic and dietary practice, Dhaka, Bangladesh, 2021 ↵</p>	Revised accordingly						
4	<p>Numbers do not add up in Table 3.</p> <p>Education ↵</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>No education ↵</td> <td>32 (62.2) ↵</td> <td>12 (37.8) ↵</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Any education ↵</td> <td>67 (45.1) ↵</td> <td>23 (22.3) ↵</td> </tr> </table>	No education ↵	32 (62.2) ↵	12 (37.8) ↵	Any education ↵	67 (45.1) ↵	23 (22.3) ↵	Revised accordingly
No education ↵	32 (62.2) ↵	12 (37.8) ↵						
Any education ↵	67 (45.1) ↵	23 (22.3) ↵						
5	<p>There is no * in Table 2.</p> <p>303 *: SD, Standard deviation.</p>	Revised accordingly						