SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SCIENCEDOMAIN

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JAMMR_45281**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Correlation between SUA and Blood Pressure in Plateau Central**
Type of the 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:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

SDI Review Form 1.6

<mark>PART 1</mark>: **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	**Writing is not good, from the beginning of the title and abstract, to missing legends from the graphics, to text and references.** **Introduction:** lack of link among paragraphs; the meaning to SUA (as its first time in the text) is also missing. It also happens with all acronyms along the text (it did it right on the method section with SBP and DBP). Pay attention. **Methods:** how come you only study a specific population and do not bring it into consideration on title and on introduction. And why do you present results in the method section? How did you get into 2 groups? Randomly? It is not clear… and once again you present result in you methods. "a brief health education was given" is not clear for me Blood analysis description is incomplete and confuse. If it is a consensual method of analysis it should be referenced so. All statements in which you authors are replying someone else's idea, must be referenced. This also happens when describing your classification to BMI. Attention. Statistical analysis was very poor and incomplete. How did you get all your 200 subjects? Consecutive? Randomly? And what about sample size? And what about finding if your parametric or non-parametric sample? This is strongly recommended … i. e. as you did not do it, how do you know if your are going to use pearson instead of spearman analysis? You must also write what values form the correlation you are going to accept as poor, and strong ones. **Results:** "Prevalence 15.5% with SUA prevalence" in line 151 is very confusing. You have to call all tables up along the text Table 2 in not necessary at al. it has to be writing in the text. And you have to review your concept of strongly correlated as well. You must call all figures up along the text However, the figures, the way they are, are not necessary **Discussion:** Is very poor and incomplete. It was almost an introduction from a different paper. You had only 7 papers to discuss your results. **Conclusion:** reading your conclusion it does not bring a clue that you had a randomized trial. You also talk about lifestyle influences your results and this is not presented in the result section.	
Minor REVISION comments	English needs minor review. **All acronyms need review** Most of your references are either incomplete or wrong.	

SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	Introduction: is too long; justifying your paper is not strongly present. Please review.	

	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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	*Aline Cristina Tavares Teixeira*
Department, University & Country	*University of Sao Paulo, Brazil*