

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Medical Genetics

Manuscript NO: 83776

Title: Genome-wide Associations, Polygenic Risk, and Mendelian Randomization Reveal

Limited Interactions between John Henryism and Cynicism

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05393454

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2023-02-08

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-03-08 04:30

Reviewer performed review: 2023-03-13 09:04

Review time: 5 Days and 4 Hours

	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C:
Scientific quality	Good
	[] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair
this manuscript	[] Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Baismuchs Publishing Baishideng

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA Telephone: +1-925-399-1568 E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	 [] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. The English need improvement since there are some grammatical and syntax errors in the manuscript. For example, the words "with increased" may be as "with an increased"; "of heart" as "for heart"; "heightened risk" as "a heightened risk"; "and on" as "and"; "showed a significant" as "showed significant"; "if higher" as "if the higher"; "as having" "having"; "chi-square" as "a chi-square"; "minimal" as "a minimal"; as "Hardy-Weinberg" as "the Hardy-Weinberg"; "available as" as "available"; "associated high" as "associated with high"; "that it such" as "that such"; "method were" as "method was"; "limitation in" as "limitation of"; "are greatest" as "are the greatest". The grammar mistakes which are not mentioned here are also to be checked and corrected properly. 2. There are some typing mistakes as well, and authors are advised to carefully proof-read the text. For example, the words "Also like" may be as "Also, like"; "filesets" as "file sets"; "results we" as "results, we"; "cynicism associated" as "cynicism-associated"; "CD associated" as "CD-associated"; "all candidate" as "all candidates"; "Two sample" as "Two samples"; "work in" as "work on"; "outcomes we" as "outcomes, we"; "larger scale" as "larger-scale"; "regards to" as "regard to"; "sample



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com

size" as "sample sizes". The typos not mentioned here are also to be checked and corrected properly. 3. Check the abbreviations throughout the manuscript and introduce the abbreviation when the full word appears the first time in the text and then use only the abbreviation (For example, John Henryism (JH), SNP, Coronary Artery Risk Development in Young Adults (CARDIA), cynical distrust (CD), etc.,). And it should be in both abstract as well as in the remaining part of the manuscript. Make a word abbreviated in the article that is repeated at least three times in the text, not all words need to be abbreviated. 4. In materials and methods, the author should give a separate heading for statistical analysis at the end of the same. 5. The authors may improve the discussion of their results by focusing on the present findings and introducing data from other authors who also worked with the same or other studies with recent references. 6. The last part of the discussion should be shifted to the heading "CONCLUSION" since the authors have given "INSERT TEXT" and it should be rectified. And also the authors have given the limitation of the present investigation and the same maybe given in separate heading.