

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medical Principles and Clinical Practice
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMPCP_85134
Title of the Manuscript:	POINT PREVALENCE OF HIGH BLOOD PRESSURE AMONG UNIVERSITY OF PORT HARCOURT STUDENTS
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.journalajmpcp.com/index.php/AJMPCP/editorial-policy>)

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- In the abstract, precise the unit of the mean age (22.3±0.14...), and others parameters (BMI) even in the results session of the document- Methodology: give more details on the sample size formular, $N = \frac{Z^2 \times P \times 1 - P}{d^2}$. The exact value of each item of the formular. Your sample size calculation remains unclear. Clarify it- Lack of criteria of diagnosis of HTN and pre-HTN (cut off value and reference).- Results: try to make khi square test to compare prevalence between gender- A serious editing of the manuscript is needed.- The abstract need to be rewrite, taking into account the significant and important results of this manuscript	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- More serious need to be paid on the writing of the document. Many typo issues are noted- Verify the numeration of figure and table in the discussion session. Confusion is made	
Optional/General comments	Some of my comments are directly done on the manuscript.	

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)	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ntentie Françoise Raïssa
Department, University & Country	University of Maroua, Cameroon