

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_127104
Title of the Manuscript:	Mercury and cardiovascular health: exploring the association with hypertension and atherosclerosis
Type of the Article	Review Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it provides a comprehensive review of the association between mercury exposure and cardiovascular health, particularly focusing on hypertension and atherosclerosis. By synthesizing observational and epidemiological studies, it highlights critical biological mechanisms such as endothelial dysfunction and oxidative stress, which are essential for understanding cardiovascular disease development. The emphasis on the need for stricter regulations and global policies to mitigate mercury exposure underscores its relevance in public health discussions. Overall, the manuscript effectively addresses a pressing environmental health issue, making it a valuable contribution to ongoing research in cardiovascular health and toxicology.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title "Mercury and Cardiovascular Health: Exploring the Association with Hypertension and Atherosclerosis" is suitable as it clearly indicates the focus on mercury's impact on cardiovascular health, specifically hypertension and atherosclerosis.</p> <p>Alternative Title: "The Impact of Mercury Exposure on Cardiovascular Health: Hypertension and Atherosclerosis Risks"</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 provides a clear overview of the study's aims, design, and methodology, but it could benefit from additional details for comprehensiveness.</p> <p>**Suggestions for Addition**:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> **Key Findings**: Include a brief summary of the main findings regarding the relationship between mercury exposure and cardiovascular health outcomes. **Implications**: Mention the implications of the findings for public health or policy, emphasizing the need for regulation and monitoring. **Limitations**: Acknowledge any significant limitations of the review to provide a balanced view. <p>**Deletion**: No points need to be deleted, but the abstract could be more concise by summarizing the methodology in fewer words.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript appear appropriate for an integrative review. The organization allows for a clear presentation of the study's aims, methodology, findings, and implications, facilitating reader comprehension.</p> <p>However, it may enhance clarity to include specific subsections for key themes such as "Mechanisms of Mercury's Impact," "Vulnerable Populations," and "Public Health Implications" to further guide the reader through the content.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness through its comprehensive review of relevant literature, utilizing high-quality studies from reputable databases such as PUBMED and MEDLINE. The inclusion of both epidemiological and experimental studies enhances the validity of the findings, providing a well-rounded understanding of the relationship between mercury exposure and cardiovascular health. Additionally, the use of a systematic search strategy with specific terms and Boolean operators ensures that the review captures a wide range of relevant research, minimizing bias. The acknowledgment of limitations and methodological heterogeneity further reflects a commitment to scientific rigor, allowing for a balanced interpretation of the results.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>:-</p>	<p>The references cited in the manuscript appear to be sufficient and cover a range of studies from 2000 to 2023, ensuring that the review includes recent findings. However, to enhance the comprehensiveness of the literature review, it may be beneficial to include additional references that focus on recent advancements in understanding the biological mechanisms of mercury's impact on cardiovascular health.</p>	

Review Form 3

	<p>**Suggestions for Additional References**:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> **Recent Meta-analyses**: Look for recent meta-analyses or systematic reviews that summarize findings on mercury exposure and cardiovascular health. **Longitudinal Studies**: Include studies that provide longitudinal data on mercury exposure and its long-term effects on cardiovascular outcomes. **Mechanistic Studies**: References that explore the specific biological pathways through which mercury affects cardiovascular health, such as oxidative stress and inflammation, would be valuable. <p>These additions could provide a more comprehensive view of the current state of research in this area.</p>	
<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication, with clear and coherent expression of ideas. However, there may be instances of complex sentence structures or jargon that could be simplified for better readability.</p> <p>**Suggestions for Improvement**:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> **Clarity**: Review sentences for clarity and conciseness, ensuring that complex ideas are presented in an easily understandable manner. **Terminology**: Ensure that technical terms are defined or explained, especially for readers who may not be specialists in the field. **Proofreading**: A thorough proofreading for grammatical errors and consistency in terminology would enhance the overall quality of the manuscript. 	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript presents a valuable contribution to the understanding of mercury exposure and its potential cardiovascular effects. It effectively highlights the need for further research into the biological mechanisms and the specific populations at risk.</p> <p>**General Comments**:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> **Visual Aids**: Consider including visual aids, such as charts or graphs, to illustrate key findings and enhance reader engagement. **Future Directions**: A section discussing future research directions could provide insights into gaps in the literature and encourage further investigation in this important area. **Public Health Recommendations**: Including specific public health recommendations based on the findings could strengthen the manuscript's impact and relevance to policymakers and practitioners. <p>Overall, the manuscript is well-structured and informative, with minor revisions needed to enhance clarity and engagement.</p>	

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:	Vivek Chintada
Department, University & Country	Sri Venkateswara University, India