

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_CA_101498</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Impact of Training Programs on Awareness and Practice of Lifestyle Modifications among Hypertensive Patients attending Outpatient Clinic of the University College Hospital, Ibadan, Nigeria</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. it is very interesting project</p> <p>2. yes, it is suitable title that describe the main purpose of this paper.</p> <p>3. the abstract is a complete comprehensive as include, background, aim, methods, results, conclusion &amp; key terms</p> <p>4. it has very well subsections &amp; structures</p> <p>5. yes, it is scientifically correct specific in how to conduct the methods ( data selection &amp; collection)</p> <p>6. yes, references are all recent.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	It is good but still need a little grammar checking	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Amal Ali Mohamed Mukhtad</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Benghazi, Libya</b>