

Manuscript: **“Prevalence Of Alcohol Consumption In First-Year Romanian Medical Students And Its Association With Cardiovascular Risk Factors”**

**Submitted: 28 February 2021**

**Accepted: 22 June 2021**

**Published: 30 June 2021**

Corresponding Author: Adriana Gherbon

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n21p337

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Luisa Zanolla, Azienda Ospedaliera Universitaria Verona, Italy

**Reviewer 2:** Blinded

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

\*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- Yes
- No

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:

\*

- Yes
- No

You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:

\*

- Yes
- No

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

Yes, even though probably it would be better to mention Romania in title

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

The chemical notes are redundant for an abstract, and there is no mention of the questionnaire used

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

*(Please insert your comments)*

There are not major grammatical errors, but the text needs probably a native tongue speaker revision.

Line 106: "we have determinate": the use of the first person is to be avoided, according to ESJ author's guidelines.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

The section could be improved by dividing into sections. The Authors should define enrollment criteria: were all the students of a given University enrolled, or the participation was on a voluntary basis, and in this latter case which was the percentage of responders. Moreover, the large prevalence of female students is related to the gender distribution of first-year students or is a bias in response to questionnaire?

In the Methods section it is not mentioned the technique used for odds ratio calculation (logistic regression?)

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

\*

(Please insert your comments)

The Results section and the Discussion should be separated. The mixing of results, other studies and comments makes difficult to read this section. Moreover, when Authors mention Romania data, it is not clear whether do they refer to their own results or to nation statistics.

"Positive correlations between alcohol and smoking" are reported, but the odds ratio is significant only for females, and it is mainly due to the small number (n=23) of female students who admit drinking, where the odds of being smokers is very high, but it is not significant in males and the significance in female group affects the overall results. At least the Authors should attribute this difference only to female. Even the other differences commented are in one gender only. I would avoid to comment on BMI, which seems to have a different effect when each gender is considered alone, from when they are considered together (but the calculation is exact).

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

\*

(Please insert your comments)

The mixing of results and discussion makes difficult to assess the conclusions. The "Conclusion" paragraph is fully supported by the content of the paper. The Authors should probably comment on the results of lower percentage of alcohol users in female: is that completely a true difference, or female students are also more reluctant to admit alcohol use in a questionnaire?

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

\*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

The references are detailed, even though some papers of alcohol consumption in Romania are not considered; e.g.:

Subst Abuse Treat Prev Policy 2016;11:36

Biomed Res Int 2018;2018:6084541

J Prev Med Hyg 2018;59:E230-E235

Line 64:" with protective effect of Garlic consumption [Nicula et al, 2018]": even if it is a paper by one of the Authors, it is irrelevant in this setting.

***Please rate the TITLE of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the METHODS of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the BODY of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1

- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

\*

- Accepted, no revision needed
- Accepted, minor revision needed
- Return for major revision and resubmission
- Reject

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Line 93-95: The description of the study population should be moved to the "Results" section

Line 94: "age range" would be more specific than "age interval"

Line 96: "cross-sectional" would be more appropriate than "transversal"

Line 97: CORT 2004 questionnaire needs a reference

Line 101: the criteria for unhealthy diet are validated?

Line 107: BMI is calculated, not measured

Line 108: blood pressure is not an anthropometric measure

Line 108-110: a different abbreviation is used for abdominal circumference; AC is used in the text

Line 112: tensiometer is an instrument used for other measurements than blood pressure

Line 115: The study, not only the questionnaire, require IRB approval (not validation!)

Line 125: " The criteria for a variable to be considered a risk factor were OR > 1 (95% CI > 1)." It is not clear which comparison led to the definition of risk factor

Line 129: The Results section and the Discussion should be separated. The mixing of results, other studies and comment makes difficult to read this section

Line 147: "they did not want to create a separate opinion from the rest of the group ": the meaning of this sentence is not clear

Line 206: is this a result of this study? If not, it needs a reference



You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

\*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- Yes
- No

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:

\*

- Yes
- No

You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:

\*

- Yes
- No

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

Yes

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

Yes

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

*(Please insert your comments)*

Not many

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

Yes, however, the reason to choose medical students over other first year students is unclear.

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

Yes

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

\*

*(Please insert your comments)*

Yes

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

\*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

Yes

***Please rate the TITLE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the METHODS of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the BODY of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3

- 4
- 5

***Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

***Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

\*

- Accepted, no revision needed
- Accepted, minor revision needed
- Return for major revision and resubmission
- Reject

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

1. The manuscript mentions a correlation between alcohol and an elevated consumption of bread but does not explain any plausible reason for the correlation. Could an increase in bread consumption be rather related for it being handy over other food preparations that require cooking which is more often than not, despised by students?

2. Why were medical students chosen for the study than any random first year students?