

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_123358
Title of the Manuscript:	THE BENEFITS OF LIFESTYLE CHANGES IN THE MANAGEMENT OF HYPERTENSION : A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE
Type of the 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

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewers comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This manuscript explores how lifestyle changes can help manage hypertension, a major health concern. By 2025, 1.5 billion people will have hypertension, making it a significant challenge for health care community. Lifestyle modifications are vital to reducing this burden. 	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Suitable	
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.	Comprehensive	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Appropriate but not absolute appropriate. The abstract must include subsections such as the introduction, aim, methods used , and results.	
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.	This manuscript is scientifically less accurate and technically less sound due to insufficient literature review, absence of a narrative matrix, and unclear data abstraction and analysis method.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	Sufficient	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Suitable	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	To strengthen evidence-based findings, consider expanding the literature review, including a narrative matrix, and clearly outlining the study selection process. Incorporate a quality assessment, and clearly define the data abstraction and analysis methods to enhance scientific accuracy.	

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:	Mukesh Singh
Department, University & Country	Government Nursing College, Bazpur, India