

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CA_120562
Title of the Manuscript:	Obesity in diabetic hypertensive patients: what relationship with sympathetic hyperactivity? A study of 122 cases
Type of the Article	

[Review Form 3](#)

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript holds significant importance for the scientific community as it addresses the intricate relationships between obesity, hypertension, diabetes, and sympathetic hyperactivity, which are pivotal factors in cardiovascular and metabolic health. By examining these associations through a detailed retrospective study, it provides valuable insights into the prevalence of sympathetic hyperactivity among obese diabetic hypertensive patients, highlighting the complex interplay between these conditions. I appreciate the manuscript's focus on circadian rhythm's role in autonomic nervous system balance, emphasizing the necessity of considering autonomic function in the management of metabolic syndrome. However, the statistical significance in the findings could be stronger, and clearer implications for clinical practice would enhance its practical relevance.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is suitable but could be made more concise and informative. Here's a suggested alternative: "Sympathetic Hyperactivity and Its Relationship with Obesity in Diabetic Hypertensive Patients: A Study of 122 Cases" This revision maintains the core focus while enhancing clarity.	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract is generally comprehensive but could benefit from a few adjustments for clarity and completeness. Here are my suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clarify Objectives: Include a clear statement of the study's objectives at the beginning to guide the reader on what the study specifically aimed to investigate. 2. Expand Methods: Briefly mention the criteria for selecting patients to provide context for the study's population. 3. Results Specificity: Include specific statistical results for clarity, particularly regarding the significance of the correlation between BMI and sympathetic hyperactivity. 4. Conclusions: Add a concluding sentence summarizing the implications of the findings for clinical practice or future research. <p>Revised abstract could look like this:</p> <p>Abstract: Introduction: This study investigates the relationship between sympathetic hyperactivity and obesity in diabetic hypertensive patients. Methods: We conducted a descriptive retrospective study of 122 diabetic and hypertensive patients, aged 19 to 95 years, who underwent ambulatory blood pressure monitoring over four years, with specific inclusion criteria outlined. Results: Among participants, 31.97% were obese, and 44.26% were overweight, with an average heart rate of 69.50 ± 8.6 bpm. A significant association was found between BMI and sympathetic hyperactivity (OR=0.582 [0.232; 1.46], p=0.7297), with 43.75% of patients with sympathetic hyperactivity being obese. Discussion: These findings highlight the role of sympathetic dysfunction in cardiovascular and metabolic disorders, emphasizing the importance of autonomic assessment in metabolic syndrome management. Key Words: Circadian rhythm, obesity, hypertension, diabetes, sympathetic hyperactivity.</p> <p>These adjustments will improve clarity and enhance the abstract's impact.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript appear appropriate for conveying the research effectively. The clear separation into sections such as Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion, and Key Words helps organize the content logically, making it easy for readers to follow the study's objectives and findings.</p> <p>However, a few enhancements could be considered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Detailed Methodology: Including a dedicated subsection for methodology with specifics on patient selection criteria, measurement techniques, and statistical analysis would enhance clarity. 2. Results Presentation: Presenting results in a more structured format, such as tables or graphs, could make key findings more accessible and visually engaging. 3. Conclusion Section: A separate conclusion section summarizing the implications of the findings could provide a stronger takeaway for readers. 	
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness through its rigorous methodological approach and comprehensive analysis of data. The retrospective study design, involving 122 diabetic hypertensive patients, provides a substantial sample size, which enhances the validity of the findings. Additionally, the use of ambulatory blood pressure monitoring allows for accurate assessment of blood pressure patterns, particularly in relation to sympathetic hyperactivity. The statistical</p>	

[Review Form 3](#)

	<p>analysis, including both bivariate and multivariate methods, supports the exploration of correlations, adding depth to the conclusions drawn. Overall, the manuscript effectively integrates established concepts in cardiovascular and metabolic research, ensuring its scientific credibility.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>=</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript should ideally be evaluated for both sufficiency and recency. While I can't view the actual references, here are some general suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Recent Studies: Ensure that the references include recent studies from the last 5-7 years to reflect the latest research in sympathetic hyperactivity, obesity, and their relationship with diabetes and hypertension.2. Diverse Sources: Include a mix of primary research articles, reviews, and meta-analyses to provide a comprehensive background on the topic.3. Key Journals: References should be drawn from reputable journals in cardiology, endocrinology, and metabolic health to ensure credibility. <p>If you find specific gaps in the literature cited, consider adding studies that focus on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The role of the autonomic nervous system in metabolic disorders.• Recent findings on insulin resistance and obesity.• New interventions targeting sympathetic hyperactivity in hypertensive patients.	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication, but there are a few areas that could benefit from minor revisions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Clarity and Precision: Some sentences may be overly complex or unclear. Simplifying these could enhance understanding. Terminology Consistency: Ensure consistent use of medical and scientific terminology throughout the manuscript. Grammar and Syntax: A thorough proofreading for grammatical errors and sentence structure would improve overall readability. Flow and Transition: Improving transitions between sections can help the manuscript flow more smoothly, making it easier for readers to follow the argument. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript provides a valuable exploration of the relationship between obesity, diabetes, hypertension, and sympathetic hyperactivity. It highlights an important area of research that could have significant implications for clinical practice and patient management.</p> <p>Here are a few general comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Depth of Discussion: Expanding the discussion section to include more about potential mechanisms linking these conditions could enhance the manuscript's impact. Clinical Implications: Including a section on practical applications of the findings in clinical settings would provide valuable insights for practitioners. Future Research Directions: Suggesting areas for future research based on the findings could encourage further investigation and collaboration in this field. 	

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:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Shahid Afridi</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Dhaka University, Bangladesh</p>