

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CA_82639
Title of the Manuscript:	Delta of Egypt Acute Coronary Syndrome Registry
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalca.com/index.php/CA/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The manuscript looks into an important aspect of ACS in Egypt. It has following flaws that need to be improved up. <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The Title and the results are not in sync and need to be corrected accordingly2. The inclusion and exclusion criteria need to be well defined.3. Sample size estimation is missing and 1000 number seems arbitrary4. Multivariate analysis with logistic regression could be a better method to analyse the outcome5. ACS/NSTEMI/STEMI definitions used need to be predefined in the manuscript6. Inter and intra-site variability needs to be addressed if any and needs to be mentioned how the same was overcome7. Grammatical and language corrections need to be done to the submitted version8.	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. done2. done3. done4. done5. Defined.6. done7. Proofread.
Minor REVISION comments	Since the manuscript looks into the regional characteristics of ACS, it should be discussing references of the same from Egypt or Asian countries more rather than those from the Caucasian counterparts	Done
Optional/General comments	The manuscript needs a major revision prior to acceptance though the topic is an important one from the regional perspective of ACS	Done

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)	Nil