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)

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	1. **Title: The time phrase has not been mentioned** 2. **Abstract: Background is too much expanded which is not necessary, result and conclusion explain different findings but we should conclude about data at the result part. Also in the keyword part, it is better to consider acute coronary syndrome or delta Egypt as one keyword** 3. **Introduction: An important part of the introduction is data about previous research and registries which has been lacking in this article** 4. **Methods: The grammar of this part needs basic revision (repeated parts, using future verbs about the work that already has been done…). In addition, there is no explanation about statistical methods had been used** 5. **Results: Since it is a registry and information about the burden of disease and risk factors, reporting a simple percentage instead of ST deviation and using figures and tables together would be more attractive. There is a discrepancy between title and data (table 1), the sum of percentages does not match 100% (most tables), and some writing errors exist (QT instead of ST….). In addition, there is no table or figure compare between different groups or mortality rates but these data are mentioned in the result part of abstract** 6. **Discussion: This section consists of five fundamental parts, i.e., an introduction to the discussion, discussion of the results, new findings provided by the study, the limitations of the study, and any recommendations relevant to practice. These steps are not fully approached in this article. There is just an abstract of different articles without mentioning their similarity or difference with this article and discussion about findings. There were no strengths and weaknesses parts.** 7. **Conclusion: This part needs strong revision considering the most important findings and recommendations** 8. **Grammar: Writing grammar needs to be corrected.**	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Faezeh Dehghani-Tafti**
Department, University & Country	**Shahid Sadoughi University of Medical Science, Iran**