

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medical Principles and Clinical Practice
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMPCP_121153
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Electrocardiogram among Adult Nigerians: High Blood Pressure versus Normal Blood Pressure
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript is important for the scientific community because it contributes to the understanding of how high blood pressure affects cardiac electrical activity, particularly in asymptomatic individuals. The study highlights the significance of routine ECG screening as a tool for early detection of heart-related issues in adults with HBP, which is a critical concern in cardiovascular disease prevention.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is generally suitable</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract is comprehensive</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>It follows a logical flow with clear sections on methodology, results, and discussion. However, further breakdown within the discussion to separate the interpretation of results from literature comparisons might improve readability.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript is scientifically robust as it is based on a well-defined, retrospective study with a clear population sample and sound methodology. The use of a standard ECG protocol and the analysis of variables such as QRS duration, P-wave, and cardiac rotation provide valuable insights. The statistical methods are appropriate, and the results are presented clearly with proper interpretation. However, the paper could benefit from a more in-depth discussion of the clinical relevance of the findings in terms of cardiovascular risk management. Also, in the text there are abbreviations that are not explained, such as BMI, BSA, etc.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references are mostly sufficient and recent. A few more recent studies focusing on hypertensive heart disease in African populations could further strengthen the introduction</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The manuscript is well-written</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The study is a valuable contribution to the field of cardiovascular research. The manuscript could benefit from a more detailed discussion of the clinical implications of the results. The authors did not clearly state any limitations in the study. It would be beneficial for the authors to add a section discussing the limitations because the study uses a convenient sampling method, which might introduce bias. Convenient samples may not represent the entire population well, which could limit the generalizability of the findings. While the study claims to have matched the groups by age and sex, it is unclear if other potential confounding factors (e.g., comorbidities, lifestyle factors like smoking or physical activity) were considered. The study only considers a snapshot of ECG data and blood pressure measurements. Longitudinal data could provide more insight into the progression of high blood pressure's effects on the heart over time.</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	Andreas Protopapas
Department, University & Country	European University, Cyprus