



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Meta-Analysis*

Manuscript NO: 86522

Title: Evidence relating cigarettes, cigars and pipes to cardiovascular disease and stroke: Meta-analysis of recent data from three regions

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 05291028

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: Spain

Author’s Country/Territory: United Kingdom

Manuscript submission date: 2023-06-23

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-06-23 14:45

Reviewer performed review: 2023-06-23 15:37

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors present the results of a systematic review with meta-analysis of the evidence relating current cigarette, pipe and cigar smoking to the risk of acute myocardial infarction (AMI), ischaemic heart disease (IHD) and stroke, based on 10 studies of AMI, 23 of IHD and 31 of stroke published in 2015-2020 (for North America, Europe, and Japan). The authors found that cigarette smoking increases the risk of AMI, IHD and stroke. Very limited evidence for current cigar and current pipe smoking shows no increase in risk for IHD and stroke, no data being available for AMI. The study is potentially interesting, but can be improved if the following considerations are addressed:

1. Please avoid acronyms in the title of the publication.
2. The authors should indicate that an essential line of research in the future would be precisely the assessment of the evidence relating cigarette, cigar and pipe smoking to stroke in lacunar versus non-lacunar ischemic stroke. This recommendation is because the pathophysiology, prognosis, and clinical features of lacunar strokes are different from other acute cerebrovascular diseases (Int J Mol Sci 2022; 23, 1497). We recommend including and commenting on this reference.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Meta-Analysis*

Manuscript NO: 86522

Title: Evidence relating cigarettes, cigars and pipes to cardiovascular disease and stroke:
Meta-analysis of recent data from three regions

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 05395205

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Doctor, Postdoc

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: China

Author’s Country/Territory: United Kingdom

Manuscript submission date: 2023-06-23

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-07-23 12:44

Reviewer performed review: 2023-07-23 14:56

Review time: 2 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this study the authors performed meta-analyses of recent results for acute myocardial infarction (AMI), ischaemic heart disease (IHD) and stroke for North America, Europe and Japan. Some concerns and suggestions are listed as below: Full names of acute myocardial infarction (AMI) and ischaemic heart disease (IHD) should be provided in the title. The potential relationship has already been established in the literature. In the part of introduction, the author should mention why this meta-analyses should be performed. Why only three regions were included? I wonder if it may cause selection bias. Any potential differences between developing and developed countries? Subgroup analysis should be performed. Dose-dependent effect of smoking should be performed. Has this meta-analyses been registered?



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Meta-Analysis*

Manuscript NO: 86522

Title: Evidence relating cigarettes, cigars and pipes to cardiovascular disease and stroke:
Meta-analysis of recent data from three regions

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 05125057

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MSc, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: Croatia

Author’s Country/Territory: United Kingdom

Manuscript submission date: 2023-06-23

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-07-24 12:20

Reviewer performed review: 2023-07-26 12:02

Review time: 1 Day and 23 Hours

Scientific quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The paper of Lee et al., “Evidence relating cigarette, cigar and pipe smoking to AMI, IHD and stroke: Meta-analysis of recent data from three regions” analyses the evidence between AMI, IHD and stroke and current smoking. The authors have considered the influence of current smoking and the relative risk of the three products (cigarette smoking, cigar, and pipe smoking) on AMI, IHD, or stroke in the three regions. It is a comprehensive and up-to-date systematic review and a meta-analysis of the available data on these topics that significantly contribute to this field of research; it is also well-organized, scientifically valid, and well-written. Minor suggestions: Did the authors register the protocol in the PROSPERO database? If not, I recommend doing so. In the first sentence of the Introduction section, cited references (1,2) should be placed at the end of the sentence because the current position has no sense.