

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	Systematic review

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, the article discusses a review of the usefulness of using hypertension management applications for hypertension patients</p> <p>Yes, the title is suitable for the content of article</p> <p>Yes, abstract includes background, objectives, methods, results and conclusions</p> <p>No, the methods section needs to add guidelines and assessment of quality that researchers use in conducting reviews. Systematic review articles should also be registered in the Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO) before being reviewed.</p> <p>Yes, the article is scientifically correct, but the results and discussion sections need to be more refined in their analysis. In the results section, researchers need to group the effectiveness of using the application and compare the results of each existing study to convince readers. Researchers also need to add application items along with how to use the application. In the discussion section, researchers need to be more critical of the research results found. Researchers need to discuss each item found in the research concisely and clearly and provide a conclusion at the end of each paragraph to convince the reader</p> <p>Yes, the references are sufficient and recent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the English used is good but needs to be corrected by a proofreader because there are still several words/sentences that are not quite right</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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:	Hasriani, S.Kep
Department, University & Country	Hasanuddin University, Indonesia