

## Peer Review Report

# Review Report on Heatwave definition and impact on cardiovascular health: a systematic review

Systematic Review, Public Health Rev

Reviewer: Ana Monteiro

Submitted on: 17 Jul 2023

Article DOI: 10.3389/phrs.2023.1606266

### EVALUATION

#### Q 1 Please summarize the main theme of the review.

The main theme is making a systematic literature review about heat effects on cardiovascular morbidity and mortality (PubMed, Science Direct and Scopus) between 2018 and 2022 and focussed in the heat definition adopted.

#### Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

Strengths

The importance of creating a common standard definition of "heat"

The scientific evidence of so many criterias to define "heat" in bioclimatology.

Limitations:

The period of analysis is short (57 months).

The reason that support the choice of this period is not explained.

The SRL method should be explained with more detail.

A lack of relationship between the definition of heat and the climatological context of each case study.

The diagrams/figures should be improved.

#### Q 3 Please provide your detailed review report to the authors, structured in major and minor comments.

The comments are in the attached file

### PLEASE COMMENT

#### Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

The title is attractive. However, to be appropriate the text should be improved with climatological knowledge and references.

#### Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

Yes

#### Q 6 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

I am not a native English.

#### Q 7 Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

No.

**Q 8** Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?

Not adequately. There are many papers discussing the same topic that are not included mainly from the climatological point of view which is important as the key point is investigate the use of "heat" definitions in bioclimatology.

**Q 9** Does this manuscript refer only to published data? (unpublished data is not allowed for Reviews)

Yes.

**Q 10** Does the manuscript cover the issue in an objective and analytical manner

Yes.

**Q 11** Was a review on the issue published in the past 12 months?

No.

**Q 12** Does the review have international or global implications?

yes

#### QUALITY ASSESSMENT

**Q 13** Quality of generalization and summary



**Q 14** Significance to the field



**Q 15** Interest to a general audience



**Q 16** Quality of the writing



#### REVISION LEVEL

**Q 17** Please take a decision based on your comments:

Minor revisions.