

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CA_100342
Title of the Manuscript:	Normal blood pressure reference values in Sudanese
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.journalca.com/index.php/CA/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The study and its findings are relevant and important for the community. However, it is suggested that the title could be further enhanced to make it more captivating. For instance, a possible revision could be "Establishing Normative Blood Pressure Reference Values in Sudanese Population: A Descriptive Study"</p> <p>Regarding the abstract, it is well-formatted. However, it would be advisable to minimize the use of acronyms unless they are deemed necessary for clarity.</p> <p>Upon reviewing the manuscript, it becomes apparent that there is a need for improved organization and formatting. For instance, in the introduction section, it would be beneficial to emphasize the rationale for conducting the study in the final paragraph.</p> <p>Furthermore, the methods section is incomplete as it lacks crucial information such as the sampling technique, sample size calculation study participants and the inclusion criteria. Additionally, since different instruments were used for anthropometric measurements, it is imperative to provide a discussion on the instruments' validity, reliability, and standardization and use in study. Moreover, it would be better to mention the qualifications of the individuals who performed these measurements and whether they possessed adequate expertise along with measurement process, which is mentioned in short.</p> <p>Additionally, I would like to highlight that there appears to be a lack of relevant discussion regarding Table 4 and 5. I am uncertain about their necessity, and this is solely my perspective on the matter.</p> <p>The discussion section needs extensive revision. It would be better to discuss the main findings in conjunction with supporting references. For example, exploring the blood pressure range specific to the Sudanese population and its predictors, accompanied by supportive and contrasting findings, along with potential reasons for such outcomes.</p> <p>The discussion should conclude with a clear summary of the findings and a set of recommendations, which are currently absent in the manuscript.</p> <p>It is worth mentioning that a substantial portion of the references cited in the manuscript are considerably dated, with only one recent reference being identified. Considering the extensive body of work available on blood pressure and hypertension, it is imperative to conduct a comprehensive literature search encompassing the most recent studies.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Kindly note that the manuscript requires revision for grammatical errors, and there are instances where sentences appear incomplete or ambiguous. eg. One of the limitations in out study was that males sample size was less than females, but the overall sample was statistically representative. what is the basis for this statement?</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is both intriguing and relevant; however, it needs substantial revision and clarification to ensure its coherence and clarity.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rajina Shakya
Department, University & Country	Nepal