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PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?

Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

No - there are major issues

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

Yes - experiments and analyses were performed appropriately

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?

Yes - appropriate statistical analyses have been used in the study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

No - there are minor issues

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?

Maybe - with major revisions
GENERAL COMMENTS: It is an interesting study that adds information about a topic that has not been researched in great detail. The main concerns or limitations are that it is a cross-section study, and therefore causality cannot be inferred and that it included patients with atrial fibrillation and advanced AV block.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:
What was considered to be an abnormal laboratory data that warranted exclusion from the study? It is surprising that only 4 patients were excluded due to this criterion.
If the focus of the study was first degree AV block, patients with advanced AV block or atrial or flutter fibrillation should have been excluded from the analysis (n=116, 1.1%).
Information was confirmed with medical record or was solely based on patients description? If so, how reliable is that information?
Considering it is a cross-sectional analysis, we cannot infer that "stopping drinking could prevent first-degree AVB".
In Table 1, PR in the 1º degree AV block is 222.23±28.81 ms. According to that, some patients would have PR of 193.42 ms, thus not fulfilling the definition of PR > 200 ms. This should be clarified and modified.
Since studies in Asian population used the cutoff of PR > 0.22 s why the authors did used the 0.2 s? Are the results different if the cutoff of 0.22 s is used?

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:
Some sentences are not clear.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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