

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_78393
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Gender Difference in Blood Pressure Control and Cardiovascular Risk Factors With Diagnosed Hypertension</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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>

## Review Form 1.6

### 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>Thanks to the researchers to select this interesting subject. They try to find explanations for BP. However, the manuscript needs some revisions. It has some shortcomings that should be considered especially.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. there is some mistake to report result as this sentence that repeated several times in article: "We observed that the <b>male population</b> reported a high prevalence of cardiovascular risk factors as compared to <b>men</b> in terms of obesity, total cholesterol level and also reported low HDL levels both in hypertensive and normotensive groups."</li> <li>2. In the method section, the group under 40 years old was removed from the initial studies and re-entered in the main study. Explain the reason. However, in contradiction with this sentence, in another part of the results mentioned, the group under 40 years of age were not examined. Please clear the ambiguity</li> <li>3. The prevalence of the studied factors in the two groups of men and women should be mentioned. Table 3 shows the values of the parameters that need to be interpreted by the average reader. Instead, it is better to show the prevalence of obesity, the prevalence of high HDL, the prevalence of high blood pressure, and so on.</li> <li>4. The numbers for systolic pressure appear to be incorrect in Table 2 as mentioned in the paragraph one in the discussion section in both genders, observed similar systolic blood pressure (<math>144 \pm 18</math> vs. <math>144 \pm 18</math> mmHg) and diastolic blood pressure (<math>92 \pm 9</math> vs. <math>92 \pm 9</math> mmHg).</li> <li>5. The results should be more specific and clear in both the abstract and the text of the article: Blood pressure levels separately for men and women in both groups with a history of hypertension and no medical history. Factors affecting both men and women separately. Findings should be reorganized.</li> <li>6. There is no limitations for paper</li> <li>7. Please re-write conclusion to have better and newer key messages for audience</li> <li>8. Funding and Competing interests not declared.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In Table 3, the order of the columns in the same group of men and women should be adjusted</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>In conclusion, it is suggested that the authors make a specific suggestions for further studies on blood pressure. For example, it seems necessary to study socio-demographic variables such as marital status, education which make difference in awareness of two gender or other risk factors for BP such as lifestyle such as physical exercise, smoking, alcohol consumption, and underlying diseases in the individual, family history of high blood pressure in this area.</p>	

### 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:	Roghayeh khaliinezhad
Department, University & Country	Iran