

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_77226
Title of the Manuscript:	VARIATION IN BLOOD GLUCOSE AND BLOOD PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION AMONG STUDENTS OF A TERTIARY INSTITUTION IN PORT-HARCOURT
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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

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	<p>The current manuscript describes the variation in blood glucose and pressure among students at their local institution. The reviewer has following concerns over the study design and findings presented.</p> <p>1) The results showed differences in the blood glucose and pressure ONLY within sex (males vs females) and no other comparisons were significant. But, in conclusions (abstract & manuscript) says AGE is a predictor of cardiovascular diseases. Completely misleading and Wrong. Please correct those conclusions.</p> <p>2) In the manuscript, authors indicted that STUDENTS were recruited for study. But, Table-3 shows participants of ages up to 49 years. Are they students, staff or faculty?</p> <p>3) In line with above point, the sampling methods indicate only 5 departments selected. The reviewer thinks, it would be better indicate the degree (bachelor/masters/Ph.D.) factors into analysis if it fits and fetch significant differences.</p> <p>4) Fasting blood glucose-methods needs to be corrected. Expand FBG in that sentence and write Accu-Chek active 'glucometer' at the end.</p> <p>5) What is 'MAP' used in the 'Table-2'. Expand the abbreviation in the footnotes or respective methods how it was measured.</p> <p>6) Also, please indicate what are the range of values mentioned within brackets () under actual means+/- SD in Table-2? Why these value rages are different for males and females?</p> <p>7) The references needs to be checked for uniformity and provide missing information such as issue/volume/page numbers..etc.</p> <p>8) The manuscript needs to checked for grammatical accuracy and language corrections.</p> <p>9) Mainly, the conclusions should be corrected. Age is not a predictor of cardio/metabolic disorders. The findings only show differences due to sex difference (male vs female). Please check for reports that showed similar differences due to sexual differences and cite appropriately.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1) In the abstract-methodology, last sentence needs to be corrected. It is giving wrong details as blood sugar levels were determined manually and pressure with glucometer.</p> <p>2) Write the full form of abbreviations at their first time use in the text. WHO needs to be expanded in the beginning of second paragraph of Introduction. Authors wrote WHO full form in the following sentences without the use of abbreviated form. Please focus on these issues.</p> <p>3) Second stage-sampling methods shown only FOUR departments. The sentence needs to be checked to make sure all the FIVE departments were included.</p> <p>4) In methods, FBG was used whereas Tables & results section uses Fasting blood sugar (FBS)..? please maintain uniformity change FBS to FBG.</p>	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Upendar Rao Golla
Department, University & Country	Penn State College of Medicine, USA