

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_95732
Title of the Manuscript:	Chronic Noncommunicable Diseases of South Asian Bangladeshi Immigrants Aged >55 Years living in Toronto: Gender and Sociodemographic Perspective
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:

(<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The manuscript addresses a topic of great magnitude, with repercussions in the field of global public health, with an impact on the health of adults and the elderly, as well as the serious repercussions on mortality rates due to chronic non-communicable diseases. Still, with impairment in the various fields (biopsychosocial) of those affected.</p> <p>However, it should be noted that the study lacked clarity and coherence in the textual organization, as well as methodological weaknesses that compromise its content and, thus, replication/dissemination.</p> <p>Thus, the introduction requires concise information with more up-to-date data regarding the epidemiological profile of chronic noncommunicable diseases; as for the method, it lacks clarity, textual organization of information that allows replication and dissemination; the results, requires more objectivity in the presentation; the discussion, in part, does not address the critical position of the authors and the well-founded literature, as well as the replication of information from the results; and, finally, the conclusion responds in part to the findings and requires more objectivity.</p> <p>TITLE: It is suggested to revise the title. From: Chronic noncommunicable diseases of Bangladeshi immigrants from South Asia aged 55+ living in Toronto: gender and sociodemographic perspective. To: Chronic noncommunicable diseases of immigrants from Bangladesh: gender and sociodemographic perspective</p> <p>ABSTRACT: Authors are advised to provide more concise and clear information. Revise the textual form of the objective, so that it contemplates a single objective and with greater refinement. In the method, what is the design of the study? Who are the study subjects? Location of data collection? It is suggested to remove the total number of participants in the method, and take it to the results. Results: put the main findings. In conclusion, it responds in part to the findings. Review. Only present the relevant findings of the study.</p> <p>Descriptors: Certain terms: Noncommunicable Diseases; Diabetes Mellitus</p> <p>It is suggested to replace Blood Pressure with Hypertension and elderly people in Bangladesh with Aged.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? Yes. 	<p>INTRODUCTION: It is suggested that the authors contextualize the subject with data on the prevalence of CNCND in the global, national and local scenario. What justification of the study for the scientific community and society? Still, sometimes the authors use DCNT, sometimes DNT. Review. Review the objective of the study, consolidate the issues and, thus, unify in a single objective, as well as review the verb used in the study. Excerpt reference: The World Health Organization's goal is to reduce the prevalence of noncommunicable diseases by one-fourth by 2025. Again, the study results could help ethnic community organizations take community-based interventions to achieve the goals of WHO.</p> <p>OBJECTIVE: Rev.</p> <p>METHOD: It is suggested that authors follow the guidelines of STROBE (Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology). Better define the nature of the study, design? The authors only report a quantitative approach. Also, define which inclusion and exclusion criteria were used? What is the justification for the age group of 55 years or more? Describe the meaning the first time mentioned, then use acronyms (SPSS).</p> <p>RESULTS: Authors are suggested to review the presentation of information with greater objectivity and avoid redundancy of findings. Address the main points of the study in textual form. The authors mention that the Chi-square-χ^2 test was used to establish an association; however, this data was not very clear in the results. In table 5, the authors place as significant*, namely: 0.60*, 0.45* Still, in table 4 in the cell Multiple chronic diseases/ Single chronic disease they did not place (*): 0.01.</p> <p>DISCUSSION: It is suggested to start the discussion with an answer to the objective of the study and its main findings. The authors bring repetition of information from the results, without power of inference and discussion with the findings in the literature, as well as a critical positioning of the findings. Repetition of result information. How to analyze these findings? Provide a detailed interpretation of key findings. It is suggested to review the information learned in the first paragraph, as they address several discoveries in one. In such a way that it contemplates the findings and discusses them in a more detailed and separate way. In the paragraph, "Ethnic</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	organizations too..." which studies reinforce or contest these findings, if any. CONCLUSION: Respond in part to the study findings. What significant association was found, please describe. It is suggested to the authors greater objectivity and conclusion in the conclusion. REFERENCES: 38.0% of the references corresponding to the last five years (2018-2022). However, it requested formatting in accordance with the journal's guidelines.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Braulio Vieira de Sousa Borges
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Piaui, Brazil