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PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS: To view the full report from the academic peer reviewer, please see the attached file.

REVIEWER COMMENTS FROM REPORT: General impression: the paper addresses an important topic but there are some issues with the presentation, language and methods

Strengths:
- Significant topic
- General analytic approach is reasonable
- Use of different bibliographic databases to identify published studies is a strength

Weaknesses:
- Text needs heavy editing for English language to correct grammar and add clarity.
- Additional information about the studies (method of HF ascertainment, method of dietary assessment) needs to be collected and reported.
- Some of the results are only presented in the discussion.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:
- In the introduction it would be beneficial to provide some evidence supporting the value of assessing the association between meat and heart failure—anything about mechanisms?
- Was publication language and exclusion criteria? Mentioned in the Discussion but not the methods.
- Including a quantitative assessment of the quality of the studies in the meta-analysis may be useful.

- The discussion mentions that meta-regression was used to evaluate sources of heterogeneity, but this is not described in the methods. Also, it should be moved to results.

- Consider adding tables or figures showing the results from meta-regression, the funnel plot for publication bias, and the sensitivity analysis removing one study at a time.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

None

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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