

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medical Principles and Clinical Practice
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMPCP_94003
Title of the Manuscript:	PATTERN OF ABDOMINAL ADIPOSITY AND ITS ASSOCIATION WITH HYPERTENSION AND PREDIABETES IN OGBOMOSO, NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajmpcp.com/index.php/AJMPCP/editorial-policy> )

### PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The authors prepared this on an interesting issue, which is an important public health problem. However, there are comments and questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☞ In abstract, "Study Design, Place and Duration of Study" should be included in methodology.</li> <li>☞ As abstract is considered as a figure of whole manuscript that includes all the important points, better to add total sample size and data analysis in it.</li> <li>☞ In introduction, "study area and study center" should be taken to methodology section.</li> <li>☞ It shows that the "cross sectional study, conducted between September and October 2014", why is it not published in the past 8 years (2014-2022) and what thing initiated you to start a publication process in this year (2022)?</li> <li>☞ In methodology section, sentences under "Data Presentation and Analysis of Result and analysis" are similar. Please, look and correct it.</li> <li>☞ In discussion, you compared your research result with studies that were conducted in years later than yours (studies done after 2014). How about this? Is it possible?</li> <li>☞ Your discussion lacks clarification when comparing with other studies. Therefore, better to add scientific and or clinical explanation for each.</li> <li>☞</li> </ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Better to revise grammar	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Stated in above	

### PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Elias Ezo
Department, University & Country	Wachemo University, Ethiopia