

The study was clearly conducted and the results are not conflicting. A few questions to the authors:

- 1) Is there any data on cost/effectiveness and impact on treatment?

No, there isn't any data on cost/effectiveness and impact on treatment because they were not part of our study goals.

- 2) Is there any data on the combination of salt depletion and drug treatment? References should be cited according to the requirements of the WJC.

No there isn't any data on the combination of salt depletion and drug treatment. According to our search, no data was found in this topic.

This is an interesting manuscript about the relations of salt sensitivity to cardiometabolic risk factors and psychological characteristics.

The authors demonstrated that 56 (42.7%) of 131 participants were diagnosed with salt sensitivity. In addition, they reported that LDL-cholesterol and depression were associated with salt sensitivity on age and sex adjusted regression analysis.

This manuscript is nicely structured. However, the primary criticism of this study is the methods of statistical analyses.

The following are my comments. Please consider the extensive revision.

(Comments)

1. How was the univariate and/or age and sex adjusted regression model constructed? Why BUN and/or Cre weren't entered in the univariate and/or age and sex adjusted regression model? These variables are considered as marginally significant (Table 1, Student's t-test, P-value < 0.1). I think BUN or Cre seems to be one of the cardiometabolic risk factors. In addition, why the multivariate regression analysis was not applied to verify the independent variables? If anything, I'd like to know the data on the multivariate regression (age, sex, BMI, FBS, LDL-cholesterol, Cr or BUN, and depression). Please consider.

Based on reviewer comment, Cr and BUN are analyzed and their results have been indicated in Table 2. Also, the result of multivariate regression with all variables considered by reviewer is added to the text.

2. Page 9, line 2
Correct “in centimeters” to “in meters”.

The text is modified.

3. Page 12, Results, 4th paragraph
As for Figure 1, I’m afraid I don’t understand well that the authors would like to insist. The description for the result is too simple, so the authors should describe the results in detail.

Furthermore, are there differences between 2 groups? I think statistically analyses by two-way repeated measures ANOVA are needed. Please consider.

Study about changes of mean systolic blood pressure in different times of study was very interesting for authors. So these changes have been shown in Figure1. Based on the reviewer comment, two-way repeated measures ANOVA is performed and our findings are mentioned in the result section.

4. Table 1
As for each variable, as well as Table2, the authors should describe the unit.

Thanks for your attention, variables units are described in Table 1 and 2.

5. Table 2
As for depression, is it continuous variable (score) or categorical variable (positive or negative)?

If categorical variable, what's the definition of positive or negative? Please consider.

Depression and anxiety are categorical variable. Related description has been added in the method section.

6. Figure 1
Unfortunately, I don’t think the authors carefully explain Figure (Figure Legend).

The authors should attach an explanatory note about the vertical axes and horizontal axes of the graph. For example, SBP mmHg (vertical axes), 1: at baseline; 2: 2 hours after saline infusion; 3: before sodium and water depletion; 4: after sodium and water depletion (horizontal axes), without or with at least one (cardiovascular risk factor). Please consider.

Thanks, the legend of Figure 1is modified based on reviewer comment.

7. There are several inaccuracies in references list.

[2] Not “1966” but “1966-78”,

[3] Not “1249” but “1249-53”,

[8] Not “481” but “481-90”,

[9] Not “459” but “459-67”,

[10] Not “1465” but “1465-71”, etc.

The authors should carefully describe.

Thanks, the references are modified.