

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JAMMR_119501 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Efficacy of Smartphone Applications in Hypertension Management: A Current Systematic Review |
| Type of the 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) Yes, this manuscript is important for the scientific community. Hypertension is a major global health issue, and finding effective management strategies is critical. The manuscript provides valuable insights into the use of smartphone applications for managing hypertension, highlighting the potential benefits of digital health interventions in improving blood pressure control, medication adherence, and health-related knowledge. 2) The current title, "Efficacy of Smartphone Applications in Hypertension Management: A Current Systematic Review," is suitable as it clearly reflects the content and focus of the review. However, if a more specific title is needed, consider: "Systematic Review of Smartphone Applications for Enhancing Hypertension Management." 3) The abstract is comprehensive. It provides a clear summary of the background, objectives, methods, results, and conclusions of the review. It effectively outlines the significance of the study, the methodology used, and the key findings, making it easy for readers to grasp the overall scope and outcomes of the review. 4) Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The manuscript follows a logical flow with sections for the introduction, methods, results, and discussion. Each section is clearly defined and contributes to the overall coherence of the review. 5) Yes, the manuscript appears to be scientifically correct. The methods section describes a rigorous search strategy and inclusion criteria. The results are presented clearly with appropriate data extraction and synthesis. The conclusions are well-supported by the findings. 6) The references are sufficient and recent. The manuscript cites relevant studies and provides a comprehensive overview of the current evidence up to June 2023. No additional references are suggested at this time <p>Additional Suggestions/Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Methodology Detail: Consider providing more detail on the data extraction process, specifically how disagreements between reviewers were resolved. • PRISMA Diagram: The inclusion of a PRISMA diagram is mentioned but not provided in the file. Ensure it is included in the final version for clarity on the study selection process. • Figures and Tables: Ensure all figures and tables are well-labeled and referenced appropriately in the text. • Future Research Directions: The discussion could benefit from a more detailed exploration of future research directions, particularly regarding the long-term sustainability and cost-effectiveness of smartphone applications in hypertension management. <p>Summary of Recommended Changes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirm the title and consider a slight modification if desired. • Ensure the abstract covers all key elements of the study. • Verify that the manuscript structure is clear and logical. • Provide more details on the data extraction process in the methodology. • Include the PRISMA diagram. • Review and ensure clarity in all figures and tables. • Expand on the discussion regarding future research directions. <p>Once these changes are made, the manuscript will be well-positioned for publication and will contribute valuable knowledge to the field of hypertension management through digital</p> | |

Review Form 1.7

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | health interventions. | |
| Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Overall, the language and English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communications. However, there are a few minor grammatical errors and stylistic improvements that could enhance the readability and clarity of the manuscript. Here are some suggestions for improvement: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consistency: Ensure consistent use of terminology, especially with technical terms related to hypertension and smartphone applications.• Clarity: Simplify complex sentences to improve readability. For instance, breaking long sentences into shorter ones can help maintain the reader's attention.• Grammar and Syntax: Correct minor grammatical errors, such as verb tense consistency, subject-verb agreement, and article usage. For example, "The study shows" should be "The study shows," and "A systematic review were conducted" should be "A systematic review was conducted."• Formal Tone: Maintain a formal academic tone throughout the manuscript. Avoid colloquial expressions and ensure that the language reflects the scholarly nature of the work. | |
| 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? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Name: | Fazal Hassan |
| Department, University & Country | University of Haripur, Pakistan |