



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Advances in Research</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_29264
Title of the Manuscript:	FIXED DOSES COMBINATIONS ACTING ON CARDIOVASCULAR SYSTEM - UTILIZATION AND GENERIC COMPETITION
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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>In introduction: Paragraph 1, line 3: ...and adult mortality (17%) [Ref]. Please cite reference. Paragraph 3;75% of patients with hypertension (Ref). Please insert reference.</p> <p>Paragraph 5, last sentence: "Some combinations of antihypertensive agents exhibit additive or even synergetic effect" please give examples and cite references.</p> <p>The title of the figures should be placed below the figure. Only Tables have their title placed above.</p> <p>On page 7; ...higher response rates than either of the treatments alone [19]. Pls include more reference.</p> <p>On page 9; ..did not cause low potassium level or any adverse effects on the lipid profile. Did you carry out any biochemical analysis of Lipid profile and Potassium?</p> <p>The reference lists are inconsistent and should be properly formatted.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>Result Section of Abstract: Methodology. What is INN?</p> <p>Result section of Abstract: The 1st two sentences should be removed as it is not a result. "Many new</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>generic molecules as FDC entrance the PDL and generally, the gene . . . therapeutic groups”</p> <p>In abstract, what is DDD? Abbreviation should be defined at first used.</p> <p>In Introduction section: paragraph 3, line 4, What is BP? “Blood Pressure” Please define abbreviation at first use.</p> <p>Although the authors stated that T-test was applied for statistical analysis. No such statistic was seen anywhere in the manuscript. The degree of significance should be stated categorically. Very important.</p> <p>Why didn't the authors use a regression analysis as part of their statistics? This would have enables one to appreciate the beauty of the study.</p> <p>Clarify the plagiarism issue:</p> <p>The similarity text check is however insignificant. The related links are: http://www.medscape.com/viewarticle/7726 http://www.aafp.org/afp/2008/0501/p1279. http://www.oalib.com/relative/269062 http://europepmc.org/articles/PMC2686259 http://www.aafp.org/afp/2000/0515/p3049. http://dmsjournal.biomedcentral.com/arti http://www.tribune.cz/clanek/13206</p> <p>I strongly suggest that the Authors perform a check of the revised manuscript and store screen shot images of the results before resubmission. CrossCheck analysis program is available at</p>	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	http://www.crossref.org/crosscheck/index.html	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>It is an interesting article that should be consider for publication after a critical revision.</p> <p>The manner of use of paragraph is seriously irrelevant. The references cited in the discussion section are less than 7. An article like this should have not less than 20 citations. Most importantly that it an observational study between 2009 and 2013. More references should be cited in the discussion section.</p> <p>The reference lists are inconsistent. This should be properly taken care of.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	S.I. R. Okoduwa
Department, University & Country	Biochemistry Department, Ahmadu Bello University Zaria, Nigeria