

## Peer Review File

Article Information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/tp-23-527>

### Reviewer A

Overall good paper. I would recommend changing the title as the work mostly highlights Sinha's work and perhaps a title such as " Review of hypertension monitoring on Cardiac health outcome" would be more specific.

Comment 1: Change the title of the review to make it more specific

Reply 1: We have modified the title as advised

Changes in the text: Page 1, Title

---

I do want to ask if you came across adult studies which looked at blood pressure monitoring with auscultatory method and cardiovascular outcome. I think that would be useful to highlight in Comparison of the Efficacy and Utilization of Various Blood Pressure Monitoring Method Section.

Comment 2: Highlight adult studies which looked at blood pressure monitoring with auscultatory method and cardiovascular outcome

Reply 2: Added study as advised

Changes in the text: Page 4, Line 20

---

I suggest adding secondary hyperparathyroidism and its association with LVH as a section as well as it has been shown to be associated with LVH

Comment 3: Add secondary hyperparathyroidism and its association with LVH as a section

Reply 3: Added section as advised

Changes in the text: Page 7, Line 9

---

## **Reviewer B**

1. Good commentary on the HOT-KID study explaining the role of tighter BP control around the 50th percentile and its beneficial effect on LV remodeling. Though this is among the first pediatric trials, I don't think there is enough numbers or follow up duration in the trial to say there was evidence ruling out sub 40th percentile BP benchmarks for therapy (line no 199) As noted in the trial, both intensive and standard therapy had their BP near the 50th percentile and there was only a modest difference in BP among the groups. Will suggest writing up the conclusion part to address this drawback in the study

Comment 1: Suggest writing up the conclusion part to address this drawback in the study

Reply 1: Removed line 199 and added conclusion analysis as advised

Changes in the text: Page 9, Line 7

---

2. Can the authors detail a bit on how to improve the drawbacks or limitations of HOT-KID study on future trials? A discussion of that sort will add value to the commentary. In its current state, I don't think it adds much to the original article by Sinha.

Comment 2: Detail a bit on how to improve the drawbacks or limitations of HOT-KID study on future trials

Reply 2: Added analysis as advised

Changes in the text: Page 9, Line 16

---

## **Reviewer C**

Article written by Subhash et al is a very well written review of available literature in regards to optimal BP goals in pediatric patients.

I would like to congratulate the authors for this comprehensive review article.