

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_125968
Title of the Manuscript:	Diagnostic accuracy of calcified aortic knob found in chest radiograph for detection of coronary Artery calcification
Type of the Article	Original article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This is a good study as it highlights the potential use of a widely available, low cost diagnostic tool, chest X ray, for detecting coronary artery calcification which is a major marker of coronary artery disease. This could be useful in low socioeconomic areas where expensive tools like CT coronary calcium scoring cannot be used. Moreover it can serve as a guideline for giving statin therapy in patients without DM, HTN or previous coronary artery disease.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Appropriate.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract provides a decent overview but it would be better if the writer clearly mentions the study population, like the exclusion of diabetic patients or those with known coronary artery disease, though they were mentioned later in the manuscript. Secondly the grading system for the calcified aortic knob is briefly mentioned. Including a brief description would enhance the understanding of the reader.	Corrected in page 1
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	They were appropriate.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript clearly defines its aim, uses a clear validated grading system for calcified aortic knobs and used good sample size for achieving statistically significant results. However while the study excludes diabetic patients, it is unclear whether other risk factors, such as smoking or hypertension were accounted for in the analysis.	Corrected in page 2
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	Sufficient references	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is generally appropriate, with adequate use of medical and statistical terms. The abstract and results sections are pretty concise summarizing the key points effectively.	
Optional/General comments	I found it to be a decently written manuscript with a good rationale.	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	