

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Cardiology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCR_118791
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence and factors associated with prehypertension among final year medical students of University of Kisangani, DR Congo
Type of the Article	Research article

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"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript is important for scientific community. The high prevalence of prehypertension (40%) among medical students of University of Kisangani was shown. The factors associated with prehypertension were identified: age, family history of hypertension, family history of diabetes mellitus, moderate anxiety, coffee consumption, and irregular physical activity. Some of the factors may be controlled. The title of the article is suitable. The abstract of the article is comprehensive. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. I think that the manuscript is scientifically correct. The references are sufficient and recent. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	The language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I have some minor issues.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I would recommend in the case of insignificant difference ($P > 0.05$) do not discuss the factor effect. It is absent. In the tables and the text if the authors show exact value of probability, for instance, 0.021, it is necessary to indicate, $P = 0.021$ or $P < 0.05$, but not $P < 0.021$. 	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Vira Shekh
Department, University & Country	V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, Ukraine