

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_118839
Title of the Manuscript:	The Role of Alcohol Consumption in Cardiovascular Health: A Systematic Review & Meta-Analysis
Type of the Article	Systematic Review

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript seems important for the scientific community due to examine alcohol and death 2. Yes 3. The abstract is 4. Yes 5. The manuscript is relevant, with an adequate title and a good structure. However, there are several sections that it is recommended to improve in order to obtain a higher level of scientificity. For this purpose, it is also recommended to review the PRISMA checklist. The following is a breakdown of the different sections with the aspects to be improved. <p>Abstract It should comply with the PRISMA regulations on abstracts.</p> <p>Introduction There is a lack of common thread between the different paragraphs. For example, between paragraphs 1 and 2 of the introduction there is an abrupt jump in which cardiovascular diseases are mentioned before moving abruptly to alcohol consumption. It is suggested to connect the main ideas. For example, the first paragraph could emphasize that one of the main risk factors for cardiovascular disease is alcohol consumption, and in the following paragraph start with alcohol consumption. The second paragraph suggests focusing only on heart disease and not on diseases in general. Much of the information that appears, for example related to medications, seems irrelevant. In paragraph three I suggest eliminating what is related to mental health, as it is a single sentence that does not add much and is out of context with the rest of the introduction. In conclusion, the introduction is scattered and poor. It is recommended to focus on the object of study and include more data (epidemiological, from previous studies...).</p> <p>Materials and Method: The review does not appear to have been registered. It is suggested that, for clarity, the inclusion and exclusion criteria be formulated in a table. In Table 2 on Characteristics of Included Studies, in the column on participants it would be advisable to add the percentage of women and men within each of the studies.</p> <p>Discussion: The main conclusions are very optimistic despite the final paragraph stating the existence of heterogeneity. It is recommended to be more cautious with respect to the conclusions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. There are only four references from the last five years. It is recommended to use more recent literature and to mark with an asterisk those articles in the references that have been analyzed in the systematic review and meta-analysis. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 		
<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:	Celia Antuña-Cambor
Department, University & Country	University of Oviedo, Spain