

[ReviewForm3](#)

BookName:	Achievementsand ChallengesofMedicineandMedical Science
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_BPR_3986
TitleoftheManuscript:	Undiagnosedhypertensioninyoung professionaleducators:Recentupdate
Type oftheArticle	Book chapter

[ReviewForm3](#)

PART1:Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This study is very interesting and makes us think a lot about the recent change in the guidelines on blood pressure values determined by the American Heart Association. Considering these new values, a large part of the population is now identified as hypertensive. Although this study evaluated a small sample of health professionals who work in the area of education, this result can be expanded to the general population. And what will be the impacts of this on health care? Is there a need to medicalize this entire population now diagnosed as hypertensive, for example? This study makes us think a lot about the new guidelines and the health care in relation to the prevention of high blood pressure that should be even more emphasized.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not, please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title does not seem completely appropriate to the subject discussed in the manuscript. Although the title is within the subject, and the sample studied is composed of education professionals, the text does not emphasize the fact that this sample is young. Additionally, the terms UNDIAGNOSED HYPERTENSION and RECENT UPDATE are also underemphasized in the text. Finally, there is no mention in the title of the new AHA rules for two BP values, which is the main topic addressed in the manuscript.</p> <p>Therefore, the suggestion is that the authors rewrite the title of the article so that it more directly reflects the subject discussed in the manuscript. Example: "assessment of blood pressure levels among education professionals".</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract could be improved in some aspects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Check the formatting, as several words are grouped together. 2. The abstract needs to be revised in English; 3. The objectives of the study are described in the background section. Then in the text, there is an objectives section with a description of other different objectives of this study. It is necessary to define in the abstract and in the main text, the objectives that were actually achieved by carrying out this study; <p>In addition, there is a section of the abstract with the title "Aim and objective". This subtitle seems redundant, since these terms can be used as synonyms.</p>	

[ReviewForm3](#)

<p>Is the manuscript scientifically correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>The formatting needs to be adjusted, as the file came with several words grouped together, without spacing between them.</p> <p>Here are some suggestions to improve the quality of this work:</p> <p>1. Introduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- In the second paragraph: the authors could better explain the difference between sedentary lifestyle and lack of physical activity. They seem to have the same meaning in this sentence.- In the third paragraph, the description of the new BP values according to the AHA guideline, where it says stage 1 BP and stage 2 BP, should say Stage 1 elevated BP or hypertension. And also repeated for Stage 2 of elevated BP or hypertension.- Fourth paragraph: In the sentence that says "Earlier studies found high prevalence in school teachers, but studies on professional educators are few". It is not clear what prevalence the authors are talking about.- The sentence "Moreover, professional educator's workplace issues are subject of intense research" seems a little disconnected from the sentence that precedes it.- The sentence: "The prevalence of HTN and related factors among teachers did not address largely yet in India." is not clear.	
---	---	--

	<p>-Thesentence“Study wasaimedtostudytheBPinprofessionaleducatorsagedbetween30and50years” needstobewritten moreclearly.Aretheauthorstalkingaboutpreviousstudies,orthecurrentstudythey conducted?</p> <p>2. MaterialandMethods:</p> <p>- The"study type"and"studysite"sectionsarenotveryclear.Isuggestthattheauthorsrewritethese sections.</p> <p>- InclusionCriteria: Thesentence“Thefollowingcriteriawereincludedinthestudy”couldberewordedtoexplainthatthese were the criteria for including the sample in the study.</p> <p>- Whowouldtheinclusioncriterion“Bothmaleandfemales”beexcluding?</p> <p>- Methodology: Thenameofthissectioncouldbechanged,since methodologymeansstudyofthemethod.Theauthors are not studying the method, but rather describing which method was chosen and carried out in the execution of this study. A suggested name for this section would be evaluation protocol, for example.</p> <p>- Inthesentence:“Anthropometric measurementsweredonewithstandardizedprotocols.”,whatwould be the standards chosen?</p> <p>- Inthesentence:“Meanbloodpressure(MBP)andpulsepressure(PP)werecalculated.”,theauth ors could describe which formulas were used to calculate these parameters.</p> <p>- In the methodology, the authors describe the parameters of the new AHA guideline regarding blood pressure.Thesevalueshadalreadybeendescribedinthe introduction.Theauthorscouldreview whether it is really necessary to repeat this classification in the introduction and in the methodology. One suggestion would be to leave this more detailed description only in the methodology.</p> <p>- Inthe materialandmethodssection,thereisno mentionofVadodaracity,wherethestudywas conducted. However, this city is mentioned in other sections of the manuscript.</p> <p>3. Results:</p> <p>- Thissectionhasonlyoneparagraph.Thetextisextremelyshort.</p> <p>Theauthorscouldbetterdescribehow manyparticipantswereselectedinthestudy.Iftherewerepeople excluded from the study and for what reasons they were excluded, for example.</p> <p>- Theauthorscouldalsoprovide moredetailsaboutthesample,forexampleinrelationtothenumberof men and women, age range, years of experience in the teaching field.</p> <p>Inaddition,didtheauthorscollectsocio-demographicdata?Levelofeducation,salaryvalues,econo mic class to which they belong, marital status, number of children, etc. Several of these factors could aggravate the factors that predispose to hypertension, such as stress factors.</p> <p>4.Discussion: Thediscussioniswellwrittenand addressessomeinteresting aspectsof the data collected. However,this sectionisextremelyshortandsuperficiallyaddressethe resultsfoundinthestudy.Thediscussioncould be extended to discuss more specific points of the results. On the other hand, the results could be better presented and related to each other, possibly in the form of graphs that relate the blood pressure values obtained and different anthropometric and socioeconomic characteristics of the sample.</p>	
--	--	--

[ReviewForm3](#)

	<p>Conclusion: The conclusion is related to the objective of the study described in the main text of the manuscript, but it is not completely in line with the objectives described in the abstract.</p>	
--	---	--

[ReviewForm3](#)

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	The references seem sufficient in number. However, of the 28 references listed, none were published in the last 5 years.	
Is the language/English quality of the articles suitable for scholarly communications?	No. The English quality of the article is not suitable for scholarly communication. An extensive English review is suggested for this manuscript in order to be published.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	In general, the topic of the article is interesting and relevant. The authors conducted research with a large sample. However, the results are not being valued in the way they are presented. This consequently hinders the discussion of these data. The English language needs to be revised, through a thorough review of the entire text.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ana Quenia Gomes Da Silva Allahdadi
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Bahia, Brazil