

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>)

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>This is a manuscript where authors measured blood pressure in apparently healthy Sudanese population in order to determine normal values for Sudanese population. Apart from BP they also measured BMI. They calculated the average values of BP for men and women in the different regions of Sudan, correlated BP values with age and BMI and also did prediction equations for blood pressure.</p> <p>I wonder why do authors think Sudanese population differs from the rest of the world in their BP values? How do they know that this is normal BP, did they analyse target organ damage? The title could be changed to Blood pressure values in apparently healthy Sudanese population, but I wouldn't mention reference values.</p> <p>The abstract is ok.</p> <p>The sections of the manuscript are not written as they should be, there are no conclusions. The manuscript is supposed to be scientifically correct.</p> <p>The references do not follow the cited text (for instance reference 2 is referring to prevalence of hypertension in the US according to the NHANES data and the paper that authors had put under Reference section is wrong: Brown MA, Davis GK, McHugh L. The prevalence and clinical significance of nocturnal hypertension in pregnancy. J Hypertens. 2001;19: 1437–1444.)</p> <p>Additionally, tables 4 and 5 should be corroborated more, what are a and b in the equations?</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	The paper needs serious English proofreading.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Figure numbers, names and legends should always be written below the figure itself.	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sandra Karanović Stambuk
Department, University & Country	School of Medicine, University of Zagreb, Croatia