



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>	
Optional/General comments	The introduction was written with a better English, however, there are numerous grammatical errors from the methodology onwards.	

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>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Maria Justine</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Universiti Teeknologi MARA Selangor Branch, Malaysia</i>