



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_45798
Title of the Manuscript:	CONTINUOUS MONITORING of ARTERIAL BLOOD PRESSURE and PULSE: COMPARISON of MORNING and EVENING READINGS
Type of the Article	Observational Research

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>)

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>Authors must indicate the time, preferably in UTC, when the Bp measurements were made. For instance were morning measurements made 0600-0800 hours UTC, and evening measurements made 1800-2000 hours UTC?</p> <p>Duration of the study is not over 18 years; April 1997 to March 2014 is exactly 17 years!</p> <p>It is needful to state whether the same OMRON M-10 IT tonometer was used throughout the 17 years? If so how was it standardized to ensure accuracy?</p> <p>If the patient ever changed medication from what is indicated in the paper over the 17 years study period, authors must state the specific medications and when they were taken. It is not enough to indicate "visit to the doctor for traditional therapy and selection of medications". A research paper must be more specific than that.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	The Discussion is useful but too general, and more specific exposition on the findings in this study and their possible explanation and implications.	
Optional/General comments		



SDI 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:	<i>Frederick Kwaku Addai</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University of Ghana, Ghana</i>