

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Deep diving into the cardiovascular health paradox: a journey towards personalized prevention

Review, Public Health Rev

Reviewer: Viktoria Gastens

Submitted on: 14 May 2024

Article DOI: 10.3389/phrs.2024.1606879

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main theme of the review.

The authors introduce the concept of the cardiovascular health paradox, i.e. the discrepancy between cardiovascular health and occurrence of cardiovascular diseases. They discuss the potential for cardiovascular health prediction of several novel markers and risk factors.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

Limitations: Unclear methodology.

Strengths: Important and innovative topic, broad overview of novel markers.

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

I congratulate the authors for their innovative manuscript. The methodology of the review has to be defined in more detail.

Major comments

1. The methodology of the review is unclear. Define the type and process of the review. I suggest to follow and cite a reporting guideline (e.g. <https://www.equator-network.org/reporting-guidelines/prisma-scr/>). The reporting of a search strategy and selection criteria is also applicable for narrative reviews (e.g. [https://www.thelancet.com/pdfs/journals/lanpub/PIIS2468-2667\(24\)00018-5.pdf](https://www.thelancet.com/pdfs/journals/lanpub/PIIS2468-2667(24)00018-5.pdf)).
2. A discussion section is missing and the conclusion section can be improved. Most points addressed in the conclusion were not discussed before. Add further references and move parts to the discussion section. According to author guidelines articles in Public Health Reviews have the following structure: Introduction, Methods, Results and Discussion (including limitations and conclusions).

Minor comments

3. Suggestion to extend the last paragraph of the introduction ("This would shift the narrative towards a personalized, preventive approach [...]") with potential impact of increased personalized prevention, e.g. decrease in over/misuse of interventions.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?

Yes

Q 5 Does this manuscript refer only to published data? (unpublished data is not allowed for Reviews)

Yes.

Q 6 Does the manuscript cover the issue in an objective and analytical manner

Yes.

Q 7 Was a review on the issue published in the past 12 months?

No.

Q 8 Does the review have international or global implications?

Yes

Q 9 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Yes

Q 10 Are the keywords appropriate?

Yes

Q 11 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes

Q 12 Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

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:

Major revisions.