

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Cardiovascular Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCD_107773
Title of the Manuscript:	A Comprehensive Epidemiological Study to Unveiling the Prevalence and Risk Factors of Cardiovascular Diseases in Bangladesh
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The research topic is of relevant importance not only for the scientific community but also for the actors involved in public policy. However, for the manuscript to have scientific relevance, it is necessary to include demographic data regarding the sample and study period. The categorization of variables, both qualitative and quantitative, should also be specified. As well as the criteria and cut-off points used. 2. The title should contain the age group and study period. I suggest the following title: Analysis of risk factors for cardiovascular disease in the (indicate here the ontogenetic stage) population of Bangladesh between (indicate here the study period). 3. The abstract is generally understandable, but the sample composition, including sex and age, should be included, as well as the study period. 4. The structure of the manuscript is adequate. However, the following aspects should be taken into account and included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is not clear whether the survey was conducted at three different times or whether three different studies are being analyzed. This should be clarified -The categorization of variables should be described in materials and methods. The authors mention having taken the waist measurement, but this is not included (alone or combined) as an indicator of abdominal obesity. At the same time it is mentioned to have recorded the body mass index, but weight and height measurements were not obtained? The body mass index is self-referenced? it is not clear. -There is also no mention of instruments or measurement techniques and error calculation. -What are the categories considered in the sociodemographic determinants? When was smoking or unhealthy diet or physical inactivity considered? These categories should be clearly defined. -Similarly, the categories of the socioeconomic determinants that allowed classifying the population into low educational level and low income should be defined. -Table 3 includes "rural residence" but in the methods they mention that they sampled in "villages or urban wards". -For a better understanding it is necessary to add a summary table containing all the variables analyzed, with their categories, and descriptive statistics. 5. For the manuscript to be scientifically correct, the observations and suggestions presented in the previous points should be followed. 6. The authors almost exclusively use literature related to the population of Bangladesh. The discussion could be enriched with data related to other Asian populations and those of the rest of the world, with differential economic and cultural characteristics. Citation number 9 in the third paragraph of the introduction is not included in the references. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.the linguistic quality is adequate 	

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments	The analysis of CVD risk factors is of great interest, but should be corrected and/or completed with the comments and suggestions made, which will add scientific quality to the manuscript.	
----------------------------------	--	--

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Delia Beatriz Lomaglio
Department, University & Country	Centro de Estudios de Antropología Biológica, Universidad Nacional De Catamarca, Argentina