

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Research in Cardiovascular Diseases</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJRCD_123595</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A Systematic review of the literature on the connection between anabolic steroids and Cardiovascular risk.</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<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 systematically reviews the existing literature on the connection between anabolic steroids and cardiovascular risk, highlighting the serious health consequences associated with their misuse. By consolidating findings from multiple studies, it provides a comprehensive understanding of the mechanisms through which anabolic steroids can lead to adverse cardiovascular events, such as myocardial infarction. The emphasis on the increasing prevalence of steroid abuse among athletes and the young population raises awareness of a critical public health issue that warrants further research and intervention. I appreciate the manuscript's structured approach in adhering to the PRISMA guidelines, ensuring rigor and transparency in the review process, which enhances its credibility and relevance in the ongoing discourse surrounding anabolic steroid use and health risks.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Assessing Cardiovascular Risks Associated with Anabolic Steroid Abuse: A Systematic Review of Recent Literature"</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>Yes</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes</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 appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound due to its systematic approach in reviewing the literature on the relationship between anabolic steroids and cardiovascular risks. By adhering to the PRISMA guidelines for systematic reviews, the authors demonstrate a commitment to methodological rigor, ensuring that the selection and analysis of studies are transparent and reproducible. The inclusion of a diverse range of peer-reviewed studies enhances the reliability of the findings and conclusions drawn. Furthermore, the manuscript effectively synthesizes existing knowledge on the topic, highlighting critical cardiovascular complications associated with anabolic steroid abuse, which adds significant value to the scientific community's understanding of the health risks linked to these substances.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :</p>	<p>The references provided in the manuscript are generally sufficient and cover a broad range of studies relevant to the topic. However, while most of the references are relevant, a few could benefit from more recent studies to reflect the latest research developments in the field. Including newer publications, especially from the last 3-5 years, would enhance the manuscript's currency and relevance. If available, additional references focusing on the molecular mechanisms of anabolic steroid-induced cardiovascular damage or large-scale clinical studies on the long-term effects of steroid abuse would further strengthen the literature review.</p>	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Good to go	

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<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>Mohammad Jamali</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Liwa College, UAE</b>