

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_122955
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Omega-3 Fatty Acids on Cardiovascular Disease Prevention: an updated Meta-analysis of RCTs
Type of the 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)
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.	The current article aims at systematically reviewing the use of omega-3 fatty acids as a preventive strategy for cardiovascular disease (CVD). Selected endpoints were potential changes in: serum triglycerides and LDL concentrations, rates of major adverse cardiac events and cardiac mortality. A total of 17 RCTs involving over 80k patients were evaluated. PRISMA standards were followed for meta-analysis. Overall, the Ms results are in favor of using omega-3 fatty acids supplementation as a strategy for preventing CVD.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	I would suggest to summarize very briefly some numerical results in the abstract. In contrast, I would suggest to leave out the end of final sentence "...though further research is needed to optimize their use and understand the mechanisms of action.", as it is more a discussion point than a conclusion.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	The topic is certainly not new. Study limitations are well self-declared by the Authors (heterogeneity in pts population, dose and formulations, inclusion of only publications in english language, etc.). Nonetheless, apart from limitations, the methodology is sufficiently solid and correct, with the study results adding further inputs for debate.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	If I am not wrong, I see that the most recent reference dates 2021, whereas no Refs post 2021 are cited. Could the Authors please confirm and clarify this point?	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Although the article is written in a way that is generally adequate for scientific communication, the Ms would clearly benefit of a moderate language style revision.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

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

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Claudio De Felice
Department, University & Country	Azienda Ospedaliera Universitaria Senese, Italy