

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

ESPS Manuscript NO: 3356

Title: Prevalence of Hypertension in India: A meta-analysis

Reviewer code: 00506211

Science editor: Wen, Ling-Ling

Date sent for review: 2013-04-25 20:38

Date reviewed: 2013-05-09 03:10

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The article submitted by Midha et al has been reviewed with interest. Authors present the findings from a literature search conducted regarding hypertension in India. The most interesting portion is the rising prevalence of hypertension in Rural India, as this could impact healthcare in India significantly. However, there are some specific limitations/weaknesses: Major: 1. Inclusion/exclusion criteria need slightly more elaboration. Authors should clarify if the blood pressure measurements used included chronic hypertension (ie average of 3 visits) or if acute hypertension was a factor in any of the cited articles. 2. Results – One (brief) sentence to clarify why what about the 165/123 “titles” respectively that were excluded may be beneficial. 3. References: Reference 1-3 appear to be listed as the website only. All references should be formatted according to the journal requirements. Furthermore, it appears that there are several inconsistencies amongst the reporting of the references. 4. Authors only discuss the basic finding of the updated prevalence of hypertension only. This manuscript could be potentially more impactful if the authors cited any current measures/clinical trials to investigate treatment. At the very least, authors should consider adding a section to predict any “next steps” based on the prevalence of hypertension in India. Perhaps a more robust discussion of the challenges India will be faced in dealing with the increase in hypertensive patients is warranted. Minor: 1. Discussion section, paragraph 2: “However, no consistent rising...down the years” is a confusion sentence and should be re-worded 2. When citing other author work in text, the first and middle initial should be left out. For example, “Gupta R” should be “Gupta et al.”

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

ESPS Manuscript NO: 3356

Title: Prevalence of Hypertension in India: A meta-analysis

Reviewer code: 00070411

Science editor: Wen, Ling-Ling

Date sent for review: 2013-04-25 20:38

Date reviewed: 2013-05-21 10:47

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	language polishing	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

For the authors, the following parts may be revised: 1. Keywords are not appropriate for this manuscript. Maybe prevalence should be added. 2. As a meta-analysis there is no heterogeneity test, it may be a requisite part of meta-analysis. 3. The prevalence of hypertension in different period may vary tremendous. Thus, the prevalence studies from January 2000 to June 2012 should not consolidate together.