

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_85461
Title of the Manuscript:	FREQUENCY OF CAA UNDERGOING CORONARY INTERVENTIONS PATIENTS AT TERTIARY HOSPITAL
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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<div>1. Introduction paragraph is too long. Probably some part of the introduction can be included in the discussion paragraph.</div> <div>2. The authors present patient and clinical characteristics among the whole population of 288 patients. Furthermore, they compare the prevalence of CAA in male vs female, in diabetic vs non-diabetic patients etc. What would be interesting is to show the prevalence of demographic and patient characteristics in the groups with CAA and nonCAA and then run a statistical test to see if there is a significance difference between the 2 groups (presence vs absence of CAA). This will help us understand if there are some factors that can predict the presence of CAA.</div> <div>3. Additionally, it will be interesting and very educational for the reader if the authors present clinical examples of the most common CAA that they observed.</div> <div>4. Last but not least, the authors should keep more attention on spelling and grammar. There are even some sentences that start with a small letter! Revision of Native English speaker is mandatory before next round of revision.</div>	<div>Point One: Updated</div> <div>Point Two: At that time out main concerns was to find out all the present and non present factors which was accompanied with CAA and Non CAA. Therefore we run statistical analysis on all the possible factors in comparison of itself and CAA presence and absence. Please see table 02.</div> <div>Point 03: The data was recorded in hardcopies and in primitive state of our study therefore we were unable to record common CAA in out study location.</div> <div>Point 04: Updated</div>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<div>1. Please spell out the full term of CAA when you introduce it for the first time in the text and in the title of the paper.</div> <div>2. Result section: You don't need to report both female and male gender proportions. Reporting only one of the two genders is enough. Additionally, you should use the “%” symbol instead of writing “percent”.</div>	<div>Point one: Updated</div> <div>Point two: Actually the PERCENT in spell form was to minimise the plagiarism issue. And for the gender writing was to ensure the actual data representation.</div>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The authors present interesting topic. However, it could be considered for publication only after revision of some important issues.	Thank You.

**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>	No.