

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Cardiology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCR_115466
Title of the Manuscript:	Nicotine Use and Cardiovascular Risk: A Review of the Fagerstrom Test as a Predictive Tool
Type of the Article	Review paper

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. This manuscript provides valuable insights into the complex interplay between nicotine dependence and cardiovascular health, offering a foundation for future research and aimed at reducing the burden of cardiovascular disease in nicotine-dependent populations.</p> <p>2. Yes. The title of the article effectively captures the main topics of the research</p> <p>3. Yes.</p> <p>4.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On 2.1, the content of the first two paragraphs mirrors each other. Summarize the outcomes of each reviewed study in a structured table. The review paper provides a comprehensive analysis of the relationship between nicotine use and cardiovascular risk, focusing on the utility of the Fagerstrom Test. However, clarifying the structure and flow of the paper would improve its readability and impact. <p>5. Based on the information provided, the manuscript appears to be scientifically correct</p> <p>6. Incorporating more recent references, particularly studies published within the last two to three years, could enhance the review's currency and relevance.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Ensuring consistency in referencing style and formatting throughout the paper would improve its overall professionalism and readability.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sumati Baral
Department, University & Country	Trident Academy of Creative Technology, India