

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_CA_107668</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of Marijuana on Some Cardiac Biomarkers among Smokers in Southwest Nigeria</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**Review Form 1.7**

**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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Yes, this manuscript is important for the scientific community as it provides valuable information on the effects of marijuana on cardiac biomarkers in smokers in Nigeria. This study adds to the growing body of research on the potential negative impacts of marijuana use, specifically on the cardiovascular system. The findings of this study could have significant implications for public health and further research on this topic.</li> <li>2. The title of the article is suitable as it clearly states the content and purpose of the research study. However, an alternative title could be "The Cardiovascular Effects of Marijuana on Smokers in Nigeria: A Comparative Study".</li> <li>3. Yes, the abstract of the article provides a comprehensive overview of the study. It includes the background, methodology, results, and conclusion of the research. It also mentions the keywords to highlight the main focus of the study.</li> <li>4. Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript appear to be appropriate. The abstract provides a concise summary of the study, and the introduction gives a thorough background on the topic. The methodology section outlines the study design and procedure, and the results are presented in a clear and organized manner. The discussion section then delves into the implications of the findings and suggests further areas of research. Overall, the manuscript follows a logical structure and effectively presents the relevant information.</li> <li>5. The study used a comparative design with a sufficient sample size and appropriate statistical analysis. It also includes relevant background information and discusses the potential implications of the findings. However, further research with additional cardiac biomarkers may strengthen the conclusions.</li> <li>6. I can say that the references appear to be proper and recent.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>The language and quality of the article appear to be suitable for scholarly communication. The article contains relevant keywords and provides a detailed methodology and analysis of results, making it valuable for academic research.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Here are some general comments on this manuscript:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The topic is interesting and potentially important given the increasing use of marijuana and questions about its health effects. Studying cardiac biomarkers is a relevant approach.</li> <li>- The introduction provides adequate background and rationale for investigating marijuana's impact on cardiac markers. The study aims are clearly stated.</li> <li>- The methods describe a reasonable study design, procedures, and analysis plan. Using a control group for comparison is a strength. The sample size seems sufficient.</li> <li>- The results are clearly presented in tables and summarized in the text. Statistical analysis appears appropriate to compare groups. Significant differences were found as expected.</li> <li>- The discussion contextualizes the findings well with reference to past studies. Limitations related to biomarker specificity are acknowledged.</li> <li>- References are sufficient and up-to-date. The writing is concise and straightforward. Tables and figures are clear.</li> <li>- Some limitations include the narrow demographics, lack of clinical correlations, and need for more specific cardiac biomarkers. The mechanism and clinical significance of the changes require further elucidation.</li> </ul> <p>Overall, this is a well-conducted preliminary study highlighting altered cardiac markers in marijuana users versus non-users. The results warrant additional investigation to clarify the clinical and pathological implications. Addressing limitations could strengthen future work. But this provides useful initial data on an emerging public health issue.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>leong Chon Man</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Conde de São Januário Hospital, China</b>