

**Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CA_84982
Title of the Manuscript:	Lipoprotein-associated Phospholipase A2 Activity Contributes to the Coronary Artery Disease with Metabolic 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>)

**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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Abstract-</b> results should be more specific to outcome and should focus on the objective of the study. Please rewrite.</p> <p><b>Subject &amp; Methods-</b> There is not much socio demographic data except age and sex. Tables only shows a comparison of various clinical, aetiological And laboratory difference of Metabolic and non-metabolic synd It does not explain the role of Lp PLA2 in aetiopathogenesis &amp; Its role as an independent marker for CAD. Author has included many confounding factors in the study Table 5 mentioning Regression coefficient should be explained more.</p> <p><b>Discussion and Result-</b> Overloaded with laboratory data which itself are a factor in Pathogenesis of CAD. Please focus your discussion on LpPLA2</p> <p><b>There is no mention of Odds ratio and hazards ratio in the study</b></p>	<p>We thank reviewer for his/her contributions.</p> <p>Q1: Abstract- results should be more specific to outcome and should focus on the objective of the study. Please rewrite. A1: All parts of abstract rewritten, we did it as suggested, the background-abstract improved.</p> <p>Q2: There is not much socio demographic data except age and sex. A2: Our all patients were Caucasian urban and this information added to the method part of the main text.</p> <p>Q3: Tables only shows a comparison of various clinical, aetiological and laboratory difference of Metabolic and non-metabolic synd It does not explain the role of Lp- PLA2 in aetiopathogenesis &amp; Its role as an independent marker for CAD. A3: Table 5 indicates the relationship and risk predictors of the coronary artery disease patients using multivariate stepwise regression analysis.</p> <p>Q4: Discussion and Result- Overloaded with laboratory data which itself are a factor in pathogenesis of CAD. Please focus your discussion on LpPLA2. A4: Result section improved, as well as we discussed mainly Lp-LPA2.</p> <p>Q5: There is no mention of Odds ratio and hazards ratio in the study A5: Odds is used for interpretation of logistic regression, we have used linear regression.</p>
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments		
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	I congratulate the author for choosing a relevant topic which is rarely discussed while managing patients with CAD.	

Review Form 1.6

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>	