

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_78934
Title of the Manuscript:	ESTIMATION OF BLOOD PRESSURE ON POSTPRANDIAL BREAKFAST, MEAL AND DINNER AMONG VEGETARIANS
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>

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Topic; remove a comma breakfast, meal.....</p> <p>Abstract: This should not contain abbreviations eg BP, DBP ----- every 10 min before until 90 min after each meal..... This is not clear to explain the interval of recording before and after a meal. Results should be shown rather than giving generalising statements. Authors should that they have used quantitative method (SPSS, independent t-tests). Revisit this section.</p> <p>MAIN PAPER</p> <p>Introduction: “Blood Pressure is the pressure of blood against blood vessels.” This is too general. Consider that pressure and force cannot be used interchangeably, and the force is not against vessels. Who is referred by authors in this statement....? But,.... a few hours before I wake up, my blood pressure starts to rise. This needs a reference,” Water drinking increases systolic blood pressure by 100 mmHg in some patients.” This is too direct... “As a vegetarian you cannot have meat,.....” These references should be written in ascending order....”(11–13)(4,14–18),(19)(20),(21)(22),(23)(24)(8,25–28).”</p> <p>Materials and Methods: If the sample was of volunteers, then random selection is not considered “volunteers were randomly selected....” Lunch mentioned in this section has not been included in the topic, abstract (results), therefore it should be considered in the whole study. “Before starting the study, informed consent was taken....” This should be clearly explained how ethical considerations was factored in. Was informed consent verbal or written? Why using t-test? What did the authors want to achieve? These questions should be answered.</p> <p>Results: Table 2 lacks no explanation p-value for significance and explanation.</p> <p>Discussion: This part lacks clarity of what causes statistical significance for dinner values compared to breakfast and lunch. Evidence to bring estimates as required by the topic is lacking. The authors' focus can be viewed as comparative than estimation of BP, hence this should change the authors' topic.</p> <p>References: The authors should use the standard reference style as per journal author guidelines. Check some references show page number (p) eg ref.. 1, 2, 3; some show month of publication eg, ref.. 4,5, 8; etc.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Major revision is required to address raised concerns.	
Optional/General comments	<p>The paper is not adding new knowledge from the existing one. It is written in a generalised form. In some instance using both singular and third person language.</p> <p>Note: I strongly recommend that the manuscript be given to an English editor.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

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:	Adiele Dube
Department, University & Country	Southern Africa Nazarene University, Swaziland