

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_78323
Title of the Manuscript:	Uncontrolled Hypertension as a Risk for Coronary Artery Disease: Patient Characteristics and the Role of Physician Intervention
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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>)

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The article is interesting. Hypertension is one of the most prevalent and poorly controlled risk factors, especially in patients with established cardiovascular disease (CVD). Other vascular risk factors such as obesity, smoking, age, diabetes, hypercholesterolemia, advanced age and established CVD are often situations that make BP control difficult and increase vascular risk.</p> <p>The study does not mention diabetic patients, or the percentage of patients treated with statins and antihypertensive drugs used (the number is mentioned, but not the class or how the antihypertensive treatment was intensified or with which drugs). Nor is it mentioned in the study whether the patient with uncontrolled HTN underwent ABPM for its correct identification and if a secondary cause study was carried out.</p> <p>However, I find the use of coronary calcium quantification as a tool to assess cardiovascular risk very interesting. The progression of calcification also seems to identify patients at higher risk, although this approach has limitations due to its low reproducibility.</p> <p>Perhaps a greater number of patients would have given them greater statistical significance in some points.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Fernando Jaén Águila</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Virgen de las Nieves University Hospital, Spain</i></b>