

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_118315
Title of the Manuscript:	Factors Associated with The Incident of Hypertension in Outpatient Patients at The Kramat Jati District Health Center, East Jakarta, 2024
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljocamr.com/index.php/JOCAMR/editorial-policy>)

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. This research is important to assess the risk factors for hypertension in a primary health service that describes risk factors that are in accordance with sociodemographics in that area 2. Yes, the title of this article is appropriate 3. Yes, the abstract is written in a structured and comprehensive manner. But, in the abstract section there is a writing error, the sample characteristics included in the abstract are general sample characteristics, not just those specific to hypertension. However, the characteristics described in the abstract seem to be specific to hypertensive patients. 4. Yes, the structure of this article is appropriate 5. Yes, it's appropriate 6. Yes, there are no significant problems regarding the references used 	
<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 English writing in this article needs improvement (Ex: Factor cant changed → Unmodified factors) 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tables 1-7 should be combined into one table to make it more efficient 2. Tables 8-13 should be combined into one table to make it more efficient 3. - In tables 8-13 it is better to add percentages to each table (2x2) 4. In the abstract you mentioned "Patients who did not smoke (68.3%) are hypertensive", this can give rise to a double perception, as if patients who do not smoke are actually at risk of developing hypertension. I am sure that the gender factor, which is filled in by the majority of women, influences the results of the percentage of hypertensive patients who do not smoke. Therefore, if possible, I recommend carrying out a multivariate analysis, to make everything clear and unambiguous. 5. The advantages and limitations of this research need to be added in the discussion section 6. There is an error in the abstract section, the sample characteristics included in the abstract are general sample characteristics, not just those specific to hypertension 7. In section 2.3.1 Population it is stated that the total population is 136 and only 101 were sampled, it may be explained why the other 25 patients were not included. 8. What are the hypertension criteria used in this study? 9. How can researchers find out the sodium intake of patients? (need to explain in the method section?) 10. What is the physical activity referred to in this study? (Need to explain in method) 11. Control patients (non-hypertensive) are healthy people or patients with other diseases? (Needs to be explained in method) 	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Ahmad Taufik Fadillah Zainal
Department, University & Country	Hasanuddin University, Indonesia