

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	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	The article, <i>Diagnostic accuracy of calcified aortic knob found in chest radiograph for detection of coronary artery calcification</i> , investigates the diagnostic effectiveness of identifying coronary artery calcification (CAC) through calcified aortic knobs on chest radiographs. The authors conducted an observational cross-sectional study with 441 individuals aged 40-75 without known coronary artery disease or diabetes, utilizing coronary calcium scoring from CT scans as a comparison benchmark. Their findings indicate that while a calcified aortic knob (grades 1-3) correlates strongly with CAC (positive predictive value of 88.07%), the method lacks sufficient sensitivity (61.5%) and a strong negative predictive value (46.18%), suggesting that a non-calcified knob does not reliably exclude CAC.	Agree.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	yes	
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.	In methodology: <input type="checkbox"/> Describe study design and participants: Note the cross-sectional approach and sample criteria (e.g., non-diabetic, CAD-free). <input type="checkbox"/> Outline diagnostic comparison: Mention that chest radiograph findings (calcified aortic knobs) were assessed against CT-based calcium scores using specific accuracy metrics.	Corrected in page 1
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Need improvements	The manuscript was corrected in many pages as reviewer comments.
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 observational, cross-sectional study involved 441 non-diabetic, coronary artery disease-free participants aged 40-75. Researchers evaluated chest radiographs, scoring calcification in the aortic knob on a four-point scale (0-3) and correlating it with coronary calcium scores (CAC >0) obtained via CT scans. Key performance metrics for diagnostic accuracy were calculated, including sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value (PPV), and negative predictive value (NPV).	Agree.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	yes	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments	Needs editing	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	<p>Study Overview</p> <p>Improvement Suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Add context to sample choice: Explain the reason for selecting non-diabetic, coronary artery disease-free participants.Provide more on methodology: Specify imaging techniques, grading scale rationale, and statistical methods used to compare radiographs with CT results.Summarize main metrics concisely: List the key diagnostic accuracy metrics (sensitivity, specificity, PPV, NPV) briefly and directly. <p>Discussion</p> <p>Improvement Suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Incorporate literature comparison: Relate the study's findings to those of other studies, e.g., Adar et al. and Kalsch et al., to reinforce validity.Expand on negative results: Explain why low sensitivity and NPV matter clinically and suggest potential reasons for these lower values.Address diagnostic scenarios: Discuss specific clinical scenarios where this diagnostic method would be most beneficial or limited.	<p>Explained in page 2</p> <p>Corrected in page 2-3</p> <p>List in page 6</p> <p>Corrected in page 6-7</p> <p>Corrected in page 8</p>

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	