

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_96768
Title of the Manuscript:	BLOOD PRESSURE AND HEART RATE RESPONSES IN OBESE WOMEN DURING PASSIVE AND ZERO-RESISTANCE ACTIVE EXERCISE TESTS COMPARED TO NON-OBESE CONTROL
Type of the 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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The study reinforces expected results. No originality factor.</p> <p>We suggest “young women”, and reference to geographical origin</p> <p>Abstract is fine</p> <p>Subsections and structure ok</p> <p>Methods scientifically correct. Highly recommend including of effect size r or d, for comparisons, and confidence intervals for associations</p> <p>References well selected, and, when necessary, recent</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>English is fine</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Not original, but pertinent. As it is, with effect sizes and confidence intervals, is a Q3 level article. We do not understand, why experimenters did not use oximeter to collect oxygen saturation, and in all conditions.</p> <p>if considering rewriting title, and to include effect sizes and confidence intervals</p>	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	David Paulo Ramalheira Catela
Department, University & Country	Polytechnic Institute of Santarém, Portugal