

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 UNLOADED ACTIVE EXERCISE
Type of the Article	Original 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>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1- Yes, it is important and practical for the scientific community. The discussion of measuring blood pressure and exercise load is very useful in life. But in this article, there is very little mention of the topic under study in the introduction section. 2- Yes 3- Rewrite the abstract part. The background section does not represent the goals. In the methods section, sampling method, sports test, statistical population, software and statistical method should be mentioned. 4- Yes 5- It is relatively suitable 6- The resources are appropriate. But it can add newer sources 7- In this article, only two training groups have been compared. And there is no control group. The results are hard to understand. It would have been better to use a control group so that the results could be generalized.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
Optional/General 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mehdi Rostamizadeh
Department, University & Country	Islamic Azad University, Iran