

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/jxym-23-12>

Reviewer A

Comment 1: First of all, you mentioned in the Highlights section that this is the 'First study of Bangladesh that simultaneously estimated the Na⁺ intake, K⁺ intake, and their_ratio'. This claim may not be substantiated as many other studies have reported earlier such estimation from community based cross sectional studies from Bangladesh. As example, please note the following publications:

- 1) Abu Mohd Naser , Feng J. He , Mahbubur Rahman , Norm R.C. Campbell .Spot Urine Formulas to Estimate 24-Hour Urinary Sodium Excretion Alter the Dietary Sodium and Blood Pressure Relationship Hypertension. 2021;77:2127–2137
- 2) Paul K. Whelton. Sodium, Blood Pressure, and Cardiovascular Disease. Editorial, Hypertension. 2021;77:2138–2139

Thus this unsubstantiated statement from the Highlights should be removed.

Reply 1: Thanks a lot your comment and correction. We have removed this line from the highlights.

Comment 2: The numbers of adult population adopted in this study are very small compared to other community based studies in this regard (even compared to those mentioned in above reference). This limitation may hinder the conclusion made in this study. Please add comments or discussion on this limited n number to substantiate your conclusion here in the manuscript.

Reply2: Thanks for your valuable comment on this aspect. We have few lines on the end of our manuscript where we stated (Line no : 278-282)

“On the other hand, convenience selection and recruitment of a small sample size due to the coronavirus 2019 pandemic limits the generalizability of the study findings. Moreover, we did not adjust our findings for energy intake and loss of Na⁺ and K⁺ other than the urinary tract. As a result, sex-specific findings may not be accurate as estimated and Na⁺, as well as K⁺ excretion may not be comparable with other countries where these adjustments considered”

We are aware of our inability to make generalizations due to the tiny sample size. Essentially, it was a student project, while it was required for the course. We were given a very little budget for laboratory-based investigation. Above essential, we have to begin and conclude the work while the COVID 19 pandemic is in full swing according to the funding authority's mandate.

Here, we have added our limitation on conclusion through this lines (Line no: 284-289)

“In conclusion, analysis of spot urine samples revealed the majority of the urban community people are habituated to consume high Na⁺ and low K⁺. Though Small sample size and lack of adjustments for energy intake and Na⁺/K⁺ excretion limits generalizability of study findings. Hence, the findings suggests, women and those used to add salt while taking a meal are the primary target of intervention to bring favorable changes in the daily intake of Na⁺ and K⁺ in an urban setting”

Comment 3: Please add and discuss the implications of these similar references (as mentioned above) in your manuscript.

Reply 3: We have added this on discussion (Line no : 209-212)

Reviewer B

Comment 1: Please organize the abstract in Background, Methods, Results, and Conclusions.

Reply 1: Organized the abstract as instructed (line no. 35 – 58)

Comment 2: Please put subfigure labels (A, B, C, D...) inside Figure 2.

Reply 2: Given labels A and B inside Figure 2 (line no.: 477)

Comment 3: Please add the unit of Y-axis in Figure 2.

Reply 3: Added units of Y-axis (line no.: 477)

Comment 4: Reference #39 and #42 are the same.

Reply 4: We have omitted the reference 42 and after that numbered the references consecutively in the order both at text and reference list.

Comment 5: The captions of Figures 2A and 2B are identical to the overview caption. Please revise.

Reply 5: We revised the Figure and kept one figure. It is attached in the manuscript and also in required format. Line no 233

Comment 6. Please indicate what "yes" and "no" represent in Figure 2B. What is the question?

Reply 6: The question was regarding salt intake intake behaviour. Who took extra salt=Yes, Who do not=No. For clarification, we have omitted that part.

Comment 7. This number does not match with that in Table 1.

208 years, and most (57.6%) of the participants graduated. Their mean BMI was 25.2

Reply 7: We have corrected it. Line no 215

Comment 8. Please explain what "n=35" means here in Table 1.

Always or often used added salt (n = 35)↵

Reply 8: Total number of people who always or often used added salt. It was a typing mistake. We discarded it.

Comment 9. This number does not match with that in Table 2.

218 which was higher in women than men (176.6 mmol/L versus 151.4 mmol/L). The

Reply 9: This number is actually misleading and a typing mistake. We omitted it from the text for clarification. Line no 224