



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012 BJMMR 2685
Title of the Manuscript:	Knowledge of hypertension and other risk factors for heart disease among Yoruba Rural Southwestern Nigerian Population

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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 authors must be congratulated for using a large population sample size to determine the knowledge of hypertension and other risk factors for heart disease among the Nigerian rural populace. However, the following issues must be addressed before accepting the paper:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. From the <i>Title</i> to the end of the paper must be written according to the Journal format. 2. The <i>Abstract</i> is too long. 3. The <i>Background and aim/s</i> of the research should be briefly and clearly stated. 4. The <i>Background and Objectives</i>, which is supposed to be the <i>Introduction</i>, is too short and poorly written. 5. Create a sub-heading for <i>Statistical analysis</i>. 6. References are scanty and the authors have failed to make reference to some most currently published articles, and in particular, those concerning similar studies done in Nigerian populations (eg Iyalomhe GBS, Iyalomhe SI (2010). Hypertension-related knowledge, attitudes and life-style practices among hypertensive patients in a sub-urban Nigerian community; Ike SO, Aniebue PN, Aniebue UU (2010). Knowledge, perceptions and practices of lifestyle modification measures among adult hypertensives in Nigeria etc). 7. Write legends to the <i>Tables</i>. <i>Table 3</i> is clumsy – please reconstruct it. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The paper has been written according to the Journal format. 2. The length of the abstract has been reduced. 3. The authors believe that the background and objectives of the study are precise and detailed enough, addressing the issues at stake. 4. Ditto as above 5. There is no need for a subheading of statistical analysis 6. Relevant references have been added. It is pertinent to note that our study was on knowledge of hypertension and other CVD risk factors in the general population and not in hypertensive patients alone as in other studies. 7. Corrected



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>8. Line 9: Remove <i>s</i> from <i>diseases</i> and replace <i>the general population in Nigeria</i> with <i>rural Southwestern Nigeria</i>.</p> <p>9. Line 16: Put <i>A</i> before <i>structured</i>.</p> <p>10. Line 95: According to JNC 7 (Chobanian et al. 2003), the word <i>adherence</i> is now preferred to <i>compliance</i>.</p> <p>11. Lines 104/105: This sentence is incorrect because there is no (current) reference.</p> <p>12. Lines 104-108 should be logically written to clarify the basis of this study.</p> <p>13. Lines 109-111 should actually be part of the <i>Aims</i>.</p> <p>14. Line 120: add a small <i>s</i> to <i>CHEW</i>.</p> <p>15. Line 123: Put <i>a</i> before <i>structured</i>.</p> <p>16. Line 129: Write <i>yes/no</i> as "<i>yes/no</i>".</p> <p>17. Line 308: Write <i>report</i> as <i>Report</i></p> <p>18. Line 352: Change <i>Good level of knowledge</i> to <i>Level of knowledge</i>.</p>	<p>8. Corrected</p> <p>9. Corrected</p> <p>10. Corrected</p> <p>11. References:9,10 & 11 have been added 12 & 13 have been rewritten</p> <p>14. corrected 15. corrected 16. corrected</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		