



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Cardiology Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCR_49221
Title of the Manuscript:	GAS FLARING AND CRUDE OIL CONTAMINANTS AS MODIFYERS OF BLOOD PRESSURE IN DELTA STATE
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>)

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>I have some advice.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please indicate that one area (study) is being polluted whereas another (control) area is not. Not merely state so, but please show some confirming objective data (for example, hazard map of the country government or something like that) with reference/citation.</li> <li>2. How did you choose study and control patients? I understand inclusion/exclusion criteria.</li> <li>3. Figure is inappropriate to indicate this subtle difference.</li> <li>4. Conclusion, "Current study confirmed past findings that gas flaring and crude oil contamination causes hypertension.": This should be softened. There are many factors that may influence BP, for example, food intake, temperature/moisture, social status, altitude, exercise habit, occupation, and so on. Since these factors have not been thoroughly investigated here, you cannot say "cause-effect relationship" between pollution and higher BP. State this also in limitation of the study.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Raised point was addressed in section on study location</li> <li>2. Inclusion and exclusion criteria is clear on this</li> </ol> <p>Limitation of study is irrelevant to the discuss of this manuscript. As much as possible, we avoid irrelevant details and presented statements as recommended by journal guidelines. These are expressed in various captions presented in our manuscript. Thanks.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**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)



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></i>	
---	---	--