

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<div>1. 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).</div> <div>2. The abstract could also include the values of tne important parameters and the p value.</div> <div>3. This is an observational prospective study or retrospective study.</div> <div>4. How was the sample size calculated in case if it is prospective study.</div> <div>5. What had been the duration of the study or the period of study?</div> <div>6. The inclusion and the exclusion criteria has been well described. There are certain diseases associated which if thepatient had were excluded from the study (Page 5) these could be clubbed / grouped in the first part of the material and methods.</div> <div>7. It would have been ideal if the authors would have written the values of the important parameters in the material methods.</div> <div>8. The ECG findings could have included the number in each proposed group i.e. n = ...</div> <div>9. 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.”</div> <div>10. The coronaries are visualized via selective coronary osteal 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.</div> <div>11. 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.</div> <div>12. Similarly it would be ideal that the number should also be written for the cardiac enzymes too.</div> <div>13. The table need to be quoted in the material and method text too.</div> <div>14. Table 3: though the number of events of acute pulmonary edema, atrial fibrillation, mechanical ventilation, ventricular fibrillation, ventricular tachycardia are more in group B the p value is insignificant.</div> <div>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.</div>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<div>1. The introduction to the subject has been well written.</div> <div>2. The discussion has been well written and quite informative.</div>	

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abha Chandra
Department, University & Country	Integral Institute of Medical Sciencecs and Research, Integral University, India