[Reviewer #1]

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)
Language Quality: Grade C (A great deal of language polishing)
Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors:

This is an interesting article reporting on studies of the cardiovascular system at high altitude, with 88 references. It can be accepted only after some important revisions:

1. The most important questions this article should report on are the subject being studied, and the results so far obtained. This is reported on in the "Discussion" section. It should instead be placed in the "Results" section.

Reply: We really appreciate the reviewer to point this out. These contents have been incorporated into the results section and highlighted the revised/added contents with yellow color in the revised manuscript.

2. The authors should produce a table listing the subjects being studied, and the summarize most important points so far revealed about high altitude cardiovascular system function or disease.

Reply: Thank you very much for your comments. Keywords reflect the core themes and main content of article. Therefore, we summarized the these most important points to revealed about high altitude cardiovascular system function or disease according to the most popular keywords.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 12 Critical aspects of the cardiovascular system at high altitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>keywords</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The Abstract and Conclusion sections should be rewritten to highlight what is revealed on cardiovascular high altitude studies so far in their analysis with 88 references, instead of giving unimportant technical information such as who the authors are, where they are from, the keywords used or which journal the results appear in.

Reply: We thank the reviewer to point this out. We have revised the abstract and conclusion sections to emphasize the principal theme of this article. Furthermore, the modifications and additions in the revised original manuscript have been delineated in yellow.
1 Conflict of interest statement: Academic Editor has no conflict of interest.

2 Manuscript’s theme: The topic is within the scope of the journal.

3 Scientific quality: The authors submitted an evidence review about the latest research advances and hotspots in cardiovascular system at high altitude. The manuscript is overall qualified.

(1) Advantages and disadvantages: The reviewers have given positive peer-review reports for the manuscript. Classification: Grade C; Language Quality: Grade C. The reviewed paper provides a comprehensive examination to probe the performance and mechanisms of cardiovascular system in high altitude environment based on the Web of Science Core Collection of Science Citation Index Expanded. The article is interesting and the introduction is acceptable. The overall content is informative, well-researched, and evidence-based. However, there are several areas need some revision: (1) The abstract and conclusion sections should be rewritten to highlight what is revealed on cardiovascular high altitude studies; and (2) The conclusion section should focus on the explanation of results.

(2) Main manuscript content: The author clearly stated the purpose of the study and the research structure is complete. However, the manuscript still requires a further revision according to the detailed comments listed below.

(3) Table(s) and figure(s): There are 3 Figures and 11 Tables, and all should be improved. Detailed suggestions for each are listed in the specific comments section.

(4) References: A total of 88 references are cited, including 11 published in the last 3 years. The author does not have self-cited references. The cited references are overall sufficient and reasonable. The reviewer didn’t request the authors to cite improper references published by him/herself.

4 Language evaluation: The English-language grammatical presentation needs to be improved to a certain extent. Before final acceptance, the authors must provide the
5 Academic norms and rules: Please provide the filled conflict-of-interest disclosure form.

Reply: The filled conflict-of-interest disclosure form has been provided.

6 Specific comments:
(1) Please add the Core tip section. The number of words should be controlled between 50-100 words.

Reply: The Core tip section has been added.

(2) Please provide the PubMed numbers (https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/) and DOI
citation numbers (https://doi.crossref.org/simpleTextQuery) to the reference list and list all authors of the references. If a reference has no PMID and DOI, please provide the source website address of this reference.

Reply: Based on these comments, the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers have been added in the reference.

(3) Please provide the Figures cited in the original manuscript in the form of PPT. All text can be edited, including A,B, arrows, etc. With respect to the reference to the Figure, please verify if it is an original image created for the manuscript, if not, please provide the source of the picture and the proof that the Figure has been authorized by the previous publisher or copyright owner to allow it to be redistributed. The legends are incorrectly formatted and require a general title and explanation for each figure. For example, “Figure 1 Pathological changes of atrophic gastritis after treatment. A: ...; B: ...; C: ...; D: ...; E: ...; F: ...; G: ...”.

Reply: As suggested, the Figures have been uploaded in the form of PPT, and the legends have been corrected.

(4) Please upload the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s).

Reply: According to these comments, the detailed approval documents of fundings have been attached below.
7 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.