

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CA_94443
Title of the Manuscript:	Neutrophil-to-lymphocyte Ratio and Its Relation with Markers of Inflammation and Myocardial Necrosis in Patients with Acute Myocardial Infarction and Chronic 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>)

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	<p>Abstract: from the abstract it is not clear what the purpose of the research is</p> <p>Introduction : Clear</p> <p>Methods: Inclusion criteria for patients with first or subsequent attacks are the same? In terms of exclusion criteria, is infection due to bacteria included in the exclusion criteria? were patients with previous heart disease such as cardiomyopathy or rheumatic heart or other cases of heart disease excluded from the inclusion criteria? Is serum electrolyte examination unnecessary in cardiology cases?</p> <p>Results: What is the cutoff value Neutrophil-to-lymphocyte Ratio that is categorized as clinically meaningful in this case? in the WBC calculation there was a significant difference between group 1 and group 2. but the mean value is still in the normal range category, what is the author's opinion?</p> <p>Discussion: writing citation references in papers should not always have to write the author's name, just write the number or citation number writing too many words" in this study", it is better if you just write down the subject matter, and write down the essence of the citations that are appropriate to the subject matter. The writing of the sentences needs to be improved. Many abbreviations in the writing of this paper without any explanation or description. Conclusion: the author written "NLR is a powerful marker of myocardial injury in cases with AMI. HIn all cases, high NLR is related with myocardial dysfunction. Severe inflammation (NLR) could expect the result of the heart in cases with coronary syndrome" →but there is no description of how powerful it is said? What is severe inflammation (NLR) like?</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	an interesting study but needs some explanation	

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)	

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Wulandewi Marhaeni
Department, University & Country	Universitas Lambung Mangkurat, Ulin General Hospital, Indonesia