

**Salt intake knowledge, attitude and behaviour in a rural population of Bangladesh**Karim MAI et al. ([dr.maniko8@gmail.com](mailto:dr.maniko8@gmail.com))

<b>Reviewer's information</b>			
Date review assigned	30-Apr-23	Date review returned	4-May-23
Reviewer name	Prof. Dr. SM Saidur Rahman Mashreky	Affiliation	BUHS
Email	mashreky@ciprb.org	ORCID	0000-0001-7892-798X
Do you have any conflict of interest with the author/s?	No	Do you wish to be disclosed to the author?	Yes

<b>Reviewer's comments (08-May-23)</b> [Please select "Yes" or "No"]		<b>Author's response (27-May-23)</b> [Please write a response if the reviewer's comment is "No". You must change the manuscript as per your response. Mention line numbers.]	
1. Is the title appropriate?	Yes	-	
2. Is the research question or study objective clearly defined in measurable terms?	Yes	-	
3. Is the abstract accurate, balanced and complete?	Yes	-	
4. Is the study design appropriate to answer the research question or achieve objective?	Yes	-	
5. Are the Methods described sufficiently to allow others to repeat it?	No		We have revisited the Methods section to enhance its clarity and comprehensiveness. The revisions include additional details and explanations to ensure that the methods are now adequately described, facilitating replication by others (lines 77 to 85)
6. Are the operational definitions and ascertainment of key variables given adequately?	Yes	-	
7. Are the outcomes clearly defined?	Yes	-	
8. Are statistics used appropriately and described fully?	Yes	-	
9. Do the Results address the research question or objective clearly?	Yes	-	
10. Are the tables and figures clear and appropriate to address the objective or research question?	Yes	-	
11. Does the Discussion cover the main points of the paper?	Yes	-	
12. Are the strengths and limitations addressed?	No		We have carefully addressed the strengths and limitations of the study in the manuscript. The revised version now includes a comprehensive discussion of both the strengths and limitations to provide a more thorough understanding for readers (lines 109 to 114)
13. Are the conclusions justified by the results	Yes	-	
14. Are the references up-to-date, and appropriate?	Yes	-	
15. Is the standard of written English acceptable for publication?	Yes	-	
16. <b>Descriptive comments</b> to the authors (Divide it into MAJOR and MINOR points).			Respond and reflect it in your manuscript. If you refute, justify your argument using references. Mention line numbers.
MAJOR points			
1. The author should be commended for delving into the important issue of Non-Communicable diseases. However, the study's limited scope to a village may hinder its generalizability to rural populations in Bangladesh. Additionally, the use of		1. We inadvertently referred to convenient sampling, but the sample was systematically collected from various blocks within the village. We have now accurately described the sampling method.	

<p>a convenient sampling method raises concerns regarding the representation of the population, and the author has not provided details on how the sample size was determined.</p> <p>2. In the results section, the author notes that 77% of participants added extra salt to their meals. To obtain a more accurate understanding of the knowledge, attitudes, and perceptions surrounding the issue, it would be advisable for the author to conduct an analysis of two distinct groups. By comparing and contrasting the two groups, a more accurate measure of true attitudes can be obtained.</p>	<p>2. As we did not consider sex as a reporting domain therefore did not mention in the table. But no significant difference were found among sex mentioned in the text now. If it is not acceptable we are happy to re-produce the table after further instructions.</p>
<b>Reviewer's Recommendation</b>	Major revision

<b>Editor's comments</b> (8 May 2023)		<b>Author's response</b> (27 May 2023) Please respond to all comments from the editor and reviewer(s). Indicate the line number(s) of the manuscript where the changes are done.	
The manuscript carries some value for public health intervention for dietary salt reduction despite its limited scope. Therefore, the manuscript can be accepted as a Research Letter after addressing the Reviewer's comments. Please see the checklist for details of a Research Letter.		Dear Editor, Thank you so much for your suggestions. We are happy to revise the manuscript into "Research Letter". We have revised it according to the submission criteria and submitted for your further consideration	
<b>Editor's Decision</b>	Major revision		