

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CA_84249
Title of the Manuscript:	Highly Sensitive C Reactive Protein as a Predictor of in Hospital Outcome in Patients with Acute Coronary Syndrome
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>)

Review Form 1.6

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The division into two groups is not too clear, this statement is to be corrected..... to hs-CRP level: group A included (14) patients with hs-CRP > (2) and group B included (36) patients with hs-CRP ≥ (2). -CRP level: group A included (14) patients with hs-CRP > (2) and group B included (36) patients with hs-CRP ≥ (2). The abstract could also include the values of the important parameters and the p value. This is an observational prospective study or retrospective study. How was the sample size calculated in case if it is prospective study. What had been the duration of the study or the period of study? The inclusion and the exclusion criteria has been well described. There are certain diseases associated which if the patient had were excluded from the study (Page 5) these could be clubbed / grouped in the first part of the material and methods. It would have been ideal if the authors would have written the values of the important parameters in the material methods. The ECG findings could have included the number in each proposed group i.e. n = ... Coronary angiography: suggested “ the angiographic procedure is done in the catheterization lab via the percutaneous route under local anaesthesia using the seldingers technique” instead of “The procedure is done in a hospital cardiac catheterization lab: a local anaesthetic is usually given to numb the needle puncture site. we will make a needle puncture through your skin and into a large blood vessel. A small straw-sized tube (called a sheath) will be inserted into the vessel. The doctor will gently guide a catheter (a long, thin tube) into your vessel through the sheath.” The coronaries are visualized via selective coronary ostial injection of a dye..... instead of A video screen will show the position of the catheter as it is threaded through the major blood vessels and to the heart. When a catheter is used to inject a dye that can be seen on X-rays, the procedure is called angiography. Where the criteria of STEMI, NSTEMI and unstable angina it is suggested that the authors write the number of cases in each group one and group two. Similarly it would be ideal that the number should also be written for the cardiac enzymes too. The table need to be quoted in the material and method text too. Table 3: though the number of events of acute pulmonary edema, atrial fibrillation, mechanical ventilation, ventricular fibrillation, ventricular tachycardia are more in 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Edited Done Edited Done Done Done Done Done Done Done Done Done Done Done Done

Review Form 1.6

	group B the p value is insignificant. 15. Conclusion needs to be modified with the final results obtained in the result and to be written in detail which should be able to give a take home message.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	1. The introduction to the subject has been well written. 2. The discussion has been well written and quite informative.	

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