



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_50630
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of blood pressure measurement with two digital sphygmomanometers
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:

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



SDI 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		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Title: Adequate.</p> <p>Abstract:</p> <p>i. to include unit of measurements for body weight and height. li. The results are quite confusing, may need to be rewritten to clearly answer the research objectives.</p> <p>Introduction:</p> <p>i. sufficient but lengthy. li. lack of justification why needs to conduct such study. lii. Author to check consistency of reference citations in the text with list of references.</p> <p>Methods:</p> <p>i. Age range for inclusion criteris should be tally throughout the manuscript.</p> <p>ii. The independent and dependent variables need to be clearer.</p> <p>iii. The author did not mention the position of the subject during the BP measurement.</p> <p>iv. Sample size was calculated but subjects recruited were too large.</p> <p>Results and discussion:</p> <p>i. The lengthy results and discussion on the findings for sociodemographic were not necessary as it is not the main objective of the study.</p> <p>ii. Authors should highlight more possible reasons for the not so perfect correlation.</p> <p>iii. Why there are consistencies or inconsistencies with previous studies should be discussed.</p>	<p>I the units are in text and tables. li reviewed and corrected</p> <p>Li justification is to show if there are differences between measures with the two baumanometers, because the Official Standard Mexican to control the arterial hypertension should measure with arm baumanometer. Lii Revised and corrected</p> <p>i. Corrected 17 to 51 years (all students registered in Public University. The population was 1910 students (bachelor and postgrade)</p> <p>ii. Independent is measure blood pressure with arm baumanometer; dependent is measure blood pressure with wrist baumanometer.</p> <p>iii.</p> <p>iv. all subjects that wanted to participated were recruited.</p> <p>i. yes but they data offer some interesting differences in the measurement of blood pressure with both baumanometers.</p> <p>ii. corrected</p> <p>iii. Maybe a slight move from finger or hand should give a mistake in measurement.</p>
Optional/General comments	The introduction was written with a better English, however, there are numerous grammatical errors from the methodology onwards.	Reviewed all manuscript

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>	