



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Blood Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IBRR_32269
Title of the Manuscript:	Epidemiological, Clinical and Preventive Aspects of Hypertension at Diabetic Patients in Butembo, Democratic Republic of the Congo
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>A very good paper, however with some flaws that need revisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The title has some grammatical error that need correction -The abstract contains no background information, the results are not well presented, and also contains some grammatical errors; In research articles, you don't start a sentence with numbers. So all there percentages represented by numbers at the beginning of the sentences should be changed to words; the conclusions in the abstract are not in line with the results -In the introduction, the background information is not sound and there are also some grammatical errors -The materials and methods section lacks depth and it is not structured; no ethical considerations; no data analysis method, and also has some grammatical errors. <p>The results are not well presented</p> <p>-Suggest reasons for similarities with the Morocco and Canada studies in line 68-76 in the discussion section; This section also has some grammatical errors; no study limitations.</p>	All comments were taken into account in the manuscript
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Please clarify the ethical issue if any	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper should be sent for language control by an expert.	