

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
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)
Compulsory 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>	
Minor 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>	
Optional/General comments	The authors present interesting topic. However, it could be considered for publication only after revision of some important issues.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Niya Mileva
Department, University & Country	Medical University of Sofia, Bulgaria